HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, July 31, 1912.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the fol-

lowing prayer:

We bless Thee, our Father in heaven, that by the example of every pure, noble, self-sacrificing life, especially by that of the Jesus of Nazareth, which looms brighter and brighter as the years come and go, we are brought, if we will, in contact with the pure, life-giving currents ever flowing from the heart of the Father soul.

I am come, said the Master, that they might have life, and

that they might have it more abundantly.

Make us, we beseech Thee, susceptible to Thy holy influence that our lives may be pure, Godlike. In the spirit of the Lord Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a request for unanimous consent. I understand from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann], the leader of the minority, that a number of gentlemen on his side of the House desire to have an opportunity to-morrow to attend the notification ceremonies when President Taft will be notified of his nomination for the Presidency, and do not desire to be in the House between the hours of 12 and 3 o'clock p. m. Recognizing that that is an important event to that side of the House, I think that we should do them the courtesy of yielding to the request, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that when the House meet to-morrow at 12 o'clock there shall be general debate until 3 o'clock, the time to be

controlled by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. General debate upon what?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. General debate on the state of the Union, the Speaker to control the time. It enables gentlemen on this side, who desire to deliver speeches, to have the opportunity, and at 3 o'clock, unless the conference report on the naval bill is taken up, I give notice that I shall move to take up for consideration the cotton bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House meet to-morrow at 12 o'clock it shall spend three hours in general debate, the time to be controlled by the Speaker, and he gives notice that at the end of that time, unless the naval conference report is taken up, he will call up the bill to revise the cotton schedule. Is there objection?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if it would not be possible to arrange that when we adjourn to-day we adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning, for the purpose of taking up for

consideration the seamen's bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, Members upon this side of the House are invited to the White House to attend the notification ceremonies and to luncheon to-morrow. The ceremonies begin, I believe, at 11 o'clock in the morning, and the luncheon is at 1.30, so that it would not be practicable to accede to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Would it be possible, then, to reach an understanding that we proceed with the consideration

of the seamen's bill at 3 o'clock?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Padgett] gave notice a few days ago that he would call up the conference report on the naval appropriation bill on Thursday-to-morrow-and I take it that that is likely to be done, and, if not, the gentleman from Alabama gives notice that he will call up the cotton bill. I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I do not think there will be any difficulty in disposing of the seamen's bill and a number of other bills.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I do not think there will be, if we can get it up for consideration.

Mr. MANN. I mean before long, or before final adjournment.

I do not see any opportunity of doing it this week.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that, so far as I am concerned, I shall be very glad to see him have the opportunity to pass the seamen's bill. I am for it, but that bill has been pending in the House two or three days and has had a fair opportunity. The supply bills of the House and this tariff bill must be passed before adjournment. They are matters of great public importance, and these other bills, in my judgment, ought to give way to them until they are out of the way.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, when these various bills go to conference I think there will be plenty of opportunity to pass | reading of the Journal, I be allowed to address the House for

the seamen's bill and a number of other bills that are made privileged.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair to put my request.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraw his suggestion?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I withdraw my suggestion. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House meets to-morrow at 12 o'clock there shall be general debate for three hours, the time to be controlled by the Speaker. In addition to that request he gives notice that at 3 o'clock, unless the conference report on the naval appropriation bill is up, he will call up for consideration the cotton bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

IMPEACHMENT OF ROBERT W. ARCHBALD.

The SPEAKER. In the matter of the impeachment of Robert W. Archbald the Chair refers to the managers on the part of the House the answer of Mr. Archbald.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by my associate managers on the part of the House to say that the managers were furnished on yesterday with a certified copy of the answer of Judge Archbald, additional circuit judge for the first judicial circuit, designated a judge in the Commerce Court.

The SPEAKER. The Chair merely formally refers the

matter.

Mr. CLAYTON. I so understand, Mr. Speaker, and I am further directed to say that the managers have considered the answer in the matter of the impeachment proceedings against Judge Archbald and have directed me to present to the House, and ask its adoption, the replication to such answer, and I ask that the Clerk read the replication, which I send to the desk. (H. Rept. 1119.)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the replication.

The Clerk read as follows:

Replication of the House of Representatives of the United States of America to the answer of Robert W. Archbald, additional circuit judge of the United States for the third judicial circuit, and designated a judge of the United States Commerce Court, to the articles of impeachment exhibited against him by the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

The House of Representatives of the United States of America, having considered the several answers of Robert W. Archbald, additional circuit judge of the United States for the third judicial circuit, and designated a judge of the United States Commerce Court, to the several articles of impeachment against him by them exhibited in the name of themselves and of all the people of the United States, and reserving to themselves all advantages of exception to the insufficiency, irrelevancy, and impertinancy of his answer to each and all of the several articles of impeachment so exhibited against the said Robert W. Archbald, judge as aforesaid, do say:

1. That the said articles do severally set forth impeachable offenses, high crimes, and misdemeanors, as defined in the Constitution of the United States, and that the same are proper to be answered unto by the said Robert W. Archbald, judge as aforesaid, and sufficient to be entertained and adjudicated by the Senate sitting as a Court of Impeachment.

peachment.

2. That the said House of Representatives of the United States of America do deny each and every averment in said several answers, or either of them, which denies or traverses the acts, intents, crimes, or misdemeanors charged against the said Robert W. Archbald in said articles of impeachment, or either of them, and for replication to said answers do say that said Robert W. Archbald, additional circuit judge of the United States for the third judicial circuit, and designated a judge of the United States Commerce Court, is guilty of the misbehaviors, high crimes, and misdemeanors charged in said articles, and that the House of Representatives are ready to prove the same.

Mr. CLAVICON Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to adopt the replication.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration and adoption of the following reso-

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution,

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 654.

Resolved, That a message be sent to the Senate by the Clerk of the House informing the Senate that the House of Representatives has adopted a replication to the answer of Robert W. Archbald, additional circuit judge of the United States for the third judicial circuit, and designated a judge of the United States Commerce Court, to the articles of impeachment exhibited against him, and that the same will be presented to the Senate by the managers on the part of the House; and also that the managers have authority to file with the Secretary of the Senate, on the part of the House of Representatives, any subsequent pleadings which they shall deem necessary.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

CONSENT TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unant-mous consent that on Saturday next, immediately after the

one hour, or such time as I may desire, in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that on next Saturday, immediately after the reading of the Journal, he be allowed to speak for one hour in answer to the remarks of Mr. RODENBERG, of Illinois. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LIMITATION OF HOURS OF EMPLOYEES ON PUBLIC WORKS.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the unfinished business before the House is the bill H. R. 18787, and the

House automatically resolves itself-Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, pending the House resolving itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union I would like to ask if we can have some arrangement about closing general debate on this bill. General debate on this bill continued all of last Wednesday, and I would like to see if we can not have an arrangement by which we can close general debate to-day.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, several gentlemen on this side desire to speak in general debate. I do not know about that side of the House. from New Jersey [Mr. Kinkead] the other day said he desired to be heard in general debate. I would be perfectly willing, I think, to close general debate not later than half past 3.

WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask that general debate on this bill close not later than half past 3.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill close not later than half past 3. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The House automatically resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with the gentle-

man from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18787, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill relating to the limitation of the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon a public work of the United States and of the District of Columbia, and of all persons employed in constructing, maintaining, or improving a river or harbor of the United States and of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bar-

THOLDT] is recognized.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to tell the story of the Chicago contests. I was there, listened to the evidence, and voted on the cases as the facts warranted and my conscience

A man who loses his case is liable to abuse the court; hence I paid little attention to the cry of fraud and theft emanating from the camp of the defeated. But when United States Senators-when men like CUMMINS and KENYON from Iowa and Works from California, in quasi-official pronouncements, talk about "tainted delegates" and an "illegal nomination," I feel it is time to speak out. Of course, it is not political expediency which prompts men of their caliber to make such statements; they actually believe what they say. But I assert without fear of successful contradiction that if they do honestly believe it, they have not read the record. That record—the stenographic report of the proceedings of the Republican national committee and the committee on credentials, as well as an intelligent résumé of both—will soon be within reach of everybody; and after the gentlemen just named have read and studied it, I know what will happen—they will retract. At least, I believe them big enough to do so. The smaller fry, because it does not suit their political purpose, will probably not do it, and I do not expect them to. Although, gentlemen, I say frankly, if ever in our history political necessity imposed upon a public man the obligation of absolute mental honesty, even in the po-litical game, it is at this particular juncture. The life of the Republican Party depends upon it.

It may happen in the life of a nation that it becomes impatient with the truth and with the men who utter it. a state of the public mind is invariably due to the poison of malicious aspersion and calumny, insidiously spread, or if the temper of the people will permit, openly disseminated by the demagogue and the disgruntled politician. But, Mr. Chairman, I have an abiding faith in the sense of fairness and justice of the American people, and in presenting my facts confidently rely on that fair play which is always born of their sober

second thought.

In my judgment, it is the solemn duty of every good American citizen between now and November to carefully study the evidence in the Chicago contests in order that he may form his tions vouchsafed impartial service, their newspaper cus-

own conclusions, and I predict that the Republican cause will be strengthened in exact proportion with the numbers of those who are willing to perform that duty. In other words, to weigh the evidence with impartial care will inevitably and irresistibly lead to the conclusion that every single contest has been decided strictly in accordance with its merits. In one important instance it will be found, the national committee gave the benefit of the doubt to the Roosevelt side when a decision in favor of the Taft delegates could have been defended with equal success. As a result of his investigation it will soon dawn upon the student of the evidence that a crime, unprecedented in its brutality, has been committed against the Republican Party by those who have rashly denounced the action of the committee and vilified its members without knowing the facts, and whose criticism, strange to say, was the more bitter the less familiar they were with the evidence. Therefore, I say again, let each good Republican who believes his great party to be worth saving (I do not appeal to those who are merely looking for an excuse to desert it) read the record for himself. The discharge of this solemn duty will make him a good citizen and a better Repub-

THE MEETING OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

When on June 6 the national committee convened at Chicago the political atmosphere was pregnant with electricity, and no one realized the gravity of the situation more keenly than did the members of the committee, upon whom at that moment the eyes of the whole Nation were turned. Who are those men? Political accidents, ephemeral nondescripts, satellites of a new will-o'-the-wisp brought to the surface by minority primaries? Oh, no; each one of them was in 1908 the choice of his State delegation for membership in the highest party council; and many of them, as leaders of their State organizations had led their party through the storms of many political campaigns to I found the great majority of them to be men of affairs, earnest and high-minded men of integrity, experience, and standing, but, above all, men actuated by the spirit of Yes; they were and are Republicans. prevailing sentiment among them was, as they gathered from all the States of the Union, a sense of solemn responsibility coupled with genuine feelings of regret over the bitterness of

We can not read the hearts of men, but there is strong circumstantial evidence to prove the rectitude of the national committee. It was patent to every member that there was but one possible remedy to relieve the strain, and that was to do justice, to decide the contests fairly and impartially. Let us see whether the members of the committee were actuated by such a desire. Surely, if it had been their intention to steal the nomination, they would have insisted on secret sessions and star-chamber methods, and furthermore, in order to be sure of their prey, they would have convened just about two or three days before the convention and railroaded their plans through by sheer force of numbers, giving as an excuse that lack of time unfortunately made a more careful consideration of the contests impossible. Not only are there precedents for such procedure, but it was the course usually followed; it was the invariable party custom, because, after all, the national committee, by preparing the temporary roll, only determines the prima facie right to seats in the convention, while the final determination of the contests is left to the convention itself. Now, I ask you, what did the national committee do in this instance? If you are fair, you will admit that every single arrangement tended to the promotion of right and justice. In the first place, the committee convened 12 days before the convention and actually consumed 9 working days-from the morning of Thursday, June 6, to the night of Saturday, June 15-with the consideration of the contests, and, needless to say, the presentation of the evidence commanded the closest attention from beginning to end. So thorough, in fact, was the investigation that not a single point, once raised, was allowed to remain in doubt, and it was the consensus of opinion that never before in the history of national conventions were contests heard with more scrupulous care and more

searching inquiry into details. So much for that.

Now, as to the custom of hearing and deciding contests in secret session, I am happy to say that the first thing the committee did was to depart from this time-honored custom and to open the doors to all the press associations of the country in order that the public might actually hear the evidence in conjunction with the committee. The minority proposed to also admit correspondents of individual newspapers, but this was deemed unnecessary as every daily paper in the United States is affiliated with either one or the other of the five press associations, so that the purposes of publicity were deemed to be amply subserved by the original plan. Besides, these associa-

tomers being recruited from both camps, while individual correspondents would have written accounts colored to suit the attitude of their papers. Even to-day I sincerely rejoice in the wisdom of an arrangement which insured full publicity and at the same time that impartiality of the reports without which the tongues of calumny would have had a still wider sway. And I leave it confidently to the judgment of the American people whether arrangements which insured ample time for careful consideration as well as fullest publicity smacked of burglary or of an attempt to steal the nomination, or whether they are not corroborative evidence of the most positive kind that the majority, with the sun of heaven as their witness, were bent on doing the fair and square thing.

In discussing these preliminaries which throw so striking a light on the motives of the majority I have purposely avoided all reference to the main issue, and in the following explanation of the contests I shall continue to do so for the reason that the final defeat or success of the one or the other presidential candidate had nothing whatever to do with the merits of the cases we were called upon to decide. In the committee room, too, the main question was never the subject of even private conversa-There was, however, tremendous pressure from the outside, emanating mainly from the impetuous followers of the third-term candidate. One day we were told the committee had no right to sit in judgment on the contests and should make room for the newly elected members, the next day it was argued that the delegates from the South should not be permitted to vote in the convention as these States never contributed any electoral vote to a Republican candidate. These efforts to force a change of the rules while the game was in progress were the more ludicrous because these rules were handed down to us by conventions over which the third-term candidate himself has held undisputed control. Why had he not changed them then? And the southern delegates seem to have been regarded as very valuable acquisitions by that same candidate, judging from the way in which Mr. McHarg went after them and from the indisputable evidence touching attempts to buy them. these arguments proved unavailing with the committee, then came the attempt at intimidation by physical force. News reached the hall that the party's chieftains were to be mobbed, and really there must have been some foundation to that rumor, for the police department took extra precautions for the protection of the committee.

BOGUS CONTESTS.

While thus the tempest raged outside of the meeting room the committee calmly proceeded with its business, bent upon allaying the trouble in the party, if possible, by a fair determination of the contests. Permit me now to tell the story of these contests. Altogether there were 252 seats contested, 238 by the Roosevelt people and 14 by the Taft people. While the surprisingly large number of contests filed against Taft delegates seemed significant, the committee was ignorant of their real nature when it began its work, but after the first Alabama cases had been heard it dawned upon the members that they were bogus contests, started, as an afterthought, months after the regular party conventions had elected Taft delegates. were the work of Ormsby McHarg, who had gone South for that And what is true of Alabama proved to be also true of Virginia, Florida, and Georgia. In all these States the Roosevelt contests were devised for the sole purpose of deceiving the public—i. e., of making a showing for Roosevelt and cutting down Taft's uncontested totals. I do not ask you to take my word for this, as there is twofold proof for the truth of the assertion. That the Roosevelt members of the committeg joined hands with the Taft members to throw these contests out and that the votes of the committee on the motions to seat the Taft delegates were unanimous, is alone convincing evidence of the frivolous nature of these contests, but we have additional proof in the shape of a confession from a Roosevelt newspaper, the Washington Times, owned by Mr. Frank Munsey, one of the largest contributors to the Roosevelt campaign, which, on June 9, 1912 (after the national committee had discovered and exposed the swindle), let the cat out of the bag in the following language:

On the day when Roosevelt formally announced that he was a candidate something over a hundred delegates had actually been selected. When Senator Dixon took charge of the campaign a tabulated showing of delegates selected to date would have looked hopelessly one-sided. For psychological effect, as a move in practical politics, it was necessary for the Roosevelt people to start contests on these early Taft selections in order that a tabulation of delegate strength could be put out that would show Roosevelt holding a good hand. In the game a table showing Taft 150, Roosevelt 19, contested none, would not be very much calculated to inspire confidence, whereas one showing Taft 23, Roosevelt 19, contested 127, looked very different. That is the whole story of the larger number of southern contests that were started early in the game. It was never expected that they would be

taken very seriously. They served a useful purpose, and now the national committee is deciding them in favor of Taft in most cases without real division.

It is needless to describe the effect of the discovery of this fraud upon the national committee. No one had heard the candidate to be benefited protest against it, and the fact that he acquiesced in and condoned it warrants the conclusion that he would have been perfectly willing to profit by it if the majority of the committee had been his pliant tools. Talk about tainted delegates and adopting the motto, "Thou shalt not steal!" Mr. Chairman, it is a well-settled rule that the man who would appeal to a court of equity must come with clean hands. The court of equity in this case are the American peo-ple. What do they think of that candidate's hands? Are they not reeking with the filth of deception? And has he not, as a result of this bunko game, forever forfeited his right to raise a moral issue with anybody and on any pretext?

THE REAL CONTESTS.

By unanimous votes or viva voce votes the original number of 238 contests instituted against Taft delegates was finally reduced to the following 72:

Delega	iti
Ninth Alabama	
Arizona, at large	
Fifth Arkansas	
Fourth California	
Thirteenth Indiana	
Seventh Kentucky	
Seventi Kentucky	
Eighth Kentucky	
lleventh Kentucky	
fichigan, at large	
Third Oklahoma	
econd Tennessee	
Winth Tennessee	
exas, at large	
Texas	
Washington, at large	
First, second, and third Washington	
Total	3

INDIANA AND MISSOURI AT LARGE.

It is worthy of note that the delegates at large from Indiana are not included in this list. The fact is that the Taft delegates were seated by a unanimous vote, yet you no doubt remember Mr. Roosevelt's shricking cry of fraud at the time of the Indiana State convention. It is confidently asserted by men who should know that that outcry was in type before the polls were opened. The contest turned on the vote of Marion County with the city of Indianapolis which, according to the Star newspaper published in that city, was as follows: Taft delegates, 6,163; Roosevelt delegates, 1,480. Mr. Roosevelt's followers on the committee voted to sustain the Taft delegates, but has anybody heard Mr. Roosevelt take back his false accusations by which the popular mind was so grossly mislead?

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BARTHOLDT. Would not the gentleman permit me to finish my remarks?

Mr. WARBURTON. It is in reference to a statement the gentleman just made in regard to Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield? Mr. BARTHOLDT. I will.

Mr. WARBURTON. I understood the gentleman to say that in Indianapolis, Marion County, Mr. Taft received something like a little less than 7,000 votes, and Col. Roosevelt 1,000. understand the gentleman that he thinks that was a sufficient vote at the primary and undoubtedly gave Mr. Taft the right to the votes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I did not catch the gentleman's question.
Mr. WARBURTON. I will repeat it. I understood the gentleman to say, in Marion County, Ind., in which Indianapolis is located, President Taft received something less than 7,000 and Col. Roosevelt something over 1,000. Now, I will ask him if he thinks that that would be a sufficient vote to control Indianapolis

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.
Mr. WARBURTON. Well, now I will come to what I want to ask. Indianapolis, in Marion County, is about the size of Seattle, in King County

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I do not see—
Mr. WARBURTON. I will state to the gentleman-

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I do not see how you can compare those two contests, and when we come to Washington I will be glad to take up that contest with the gentleman, but let me ask the gentleman, since he has interrupted me, Is he a bull moose or for President Taft?

Mr. WARBURTON. I have just filed as a Republican in my State, and I exercise the right to vote for ex-President Roosevelt or President Taft when the time comes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. You can not do that as a Republican.

Mr. WARBURTON. Watch me do it. Mr. BARTHOLDT. You can not honorably. You can not ride two horses at a time.

Mr. WARBURTON. I do not try to do so.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. Which one? Mr. CLAYTON. He just has not made up his mind yet.

Mr. WARBURTON. I did not say that.
Mr. BARTHOLDT. When I was interrupted I was speaking about Missouri, and said that the Missouri contest at large had

been decided in favor of the Roosevelt delegates.

Missouri is also left out of this list because the contest at large was decided in favor of the Roosevelt delegates. It was a case, as I said before, in which, by the action of the committee, an actual doubt was dissolved in favor of the Roosevelt If the committee had ruled that the delegation be divided, such action could have been successfully defended on account of a well-authenticated understanding between the opposing convention leaders to divide the delegates and refrain from instructing them, which understanding had been violated. In the face of the committee's action in this case can you make any sane person believe that the aim and purpose of the committee was to steal delegates? This one case alone should suffice to set public opinion right on this question.

ALABAMA.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not permit myself to be dissuaded from my purpose to tell the truth about the contests above enumerated even by a realization of the difficulty of changing the people's minds. Right in connection with the first case on the list, the ninth Alabama, I can show that the truth has been mortally wounded by poisoned arrows from Oyster Bay, yet I confidently believe that the truth will live and that our great party can not be killed by prevarication. Because of its decision seating the two Taft delegates, Mr. Roosevelt issued a bitter diatribe which the country eagerly swallowed, of course, and in which he intimated that men had been sent to the penitentiary for lesser offenses, but fortunately for the truth he did not stop there. He proceeded to tell the facts in the case as he understood them, and this enables me to show how utterly misinformed he was. Evidently he had heard but one side, and with this faulty information he rushed into print. Says he:

The Republican committee of this district, composed of 30 members, The Republican committee of this district, composed of 30 members, met to call the convention. Eighteen members were favorable to my candidacy, 12 to Mr. Taft's. The Taft men conceded that this was the regular district committee and began by participating in the meeting, but as soon as it developed that the Roosevelt men were in the majority the 12 Taft men left the meeting and called a convention of their own, leaving 18 members, a clear majority of the regular committee, to call the regular convention in which the Roosevelt delegates were named. No serious evidence was presented by the national committee to contravene these facts.

Of course not. The national committee presents no evidence, but it was presented to the committee by the Republicans of the ninth Alabama district, and they did not only contravene the facts as stated by Mr. Roosevelt but told the rest of the story, namely, that the whole controversy had been passed upon by the people themselves, inasmuch as the four counties in the district recognized and responded to the Taft call for

the district convention, holding delegate conventions in two and mass conventions in the other two counties. When the district convention met all four counties were represented by unchallenged delegations and two Taft delegates were duly elected without opposition. The call of the Roosevelt faction, on the other hand, was ignored by all but one county. So the people have spoken in this case, and the question as to whether the Taft or the Roosevelt call was the regular one was decided by the Republican voters themselves. Shall the people rule? And more than that, the State convention passed upon the

case by recognizing the delegates from those four counties who had been elected under the Taft call, and the national com-mittee, by a unanimous vote, seated the delegates at large elected by that State convention. From these facts-I want the House and the country to listen to this in view of Mr. Roosevelt's course in this case—it appears that even if we conceded every claim he makes in the above statement the decision was bound to be in favor of the Taft delegates, and in truth the attorneys for the Roosevelt side never claimed regularity

for the election of their delegates, but merely questioned the regularity of the call owing to a split in the committee. And what about that? When the committee met a dispute arose as to the right of certain persons to serve as members of the committee, and this resulted in each faction holding a separate meeting in the same hall. It was well established by the evi-

dence that the Taft committee had the larger number of members whose right to serve was not questioned, to wit, 13. The right of the other two, William Latham and Harvey Hardin, whose votes were necessary to make a quorum (15) was challenged. It was claimed that not William Latham but his brother James was a member of the committee. There was ample evidence, however, that William Latham had been regularly elected a member of the committee and that he had previously acted in that capacity. As to Hardin, there was no question about his membership, but a few days before the meeting he had sent his resignation, to take effect only in case he was not present. He did appear, however, in ample time for the meeting, yet the Roosevelt chairman refused to recognize him and had appointed other men to fill this as well as other vacancies. His right to do so was sharply challenged. and it developed that his authority to fill vacancies was interpolated in a certain resolution, as it was written in between the lines in different writing and different-colored pencil. gave rise to a question of fact upon which a very large majority of the national committee held that the lead-pencil insertion was a forgery, hence that the chairman did not have the authority to fill vacancies, and therefore the action of the Roosevelt committee was not valid.

I well remember the following question, asked by a Roosevelt member of the national committee in addressing a Taft witness: Are you willing to make an affidavit that these lines in the resolution conferring authority on the chairman to fill vacancies were interpolated?

Answer:

Yes, sir.

That ended the matter, of course. Now, compare these facts with what Mr. Roosevelt says:

The contest against the two regularly elected Roosevelt delegates had literally no foundation whatever, even of the most flimsy description. There was no more ground for unseating these delegates than there would be, for example, in unseating the Taft delegates from Rhode Island, or in any district in any State where there is no contest whatever

Mr. Chairman, as you have seen, this contest would have been decided by any jury in the land in favor of the Taft delegates without them leaving their seats, yet Mr. Roosevelt made it the basis of a most virulent attack, with the plain intention of inciting the passions of his hysterical followers and bringing down upon the heads of the national committee the contempt as well as the indignation and wrath of the American people. The language of the Chicago anarchists which precipitated the Hay-market riots was incendiary, and the law reached out after them, poor wretches that they were. Is there no law to reach a prominent offender? I say it would be unpardonable to incite and poison the minds of the people at a time of great nervous tension, even if there were justification for it, but to do so as a result of misinformation and when you are clearly in the wrong is nothing less than criminal. And as Mr. Roosevelt has not yet seen fit to apologize to the national committee on account of the cruel injustice he has done them, I take this occasion to solemnly protest, on behalf of myself and my then colleagues, against the unwarranted reflection upon the integrity and the honor of the committee, as well as against the infamous attempts to create, by untruthful statements, a false public sentiment regarding the Chicago contests, to the great detriment of the Republican Party and its national candidates.

It is natural that after this Oyster Bay utterance in which, among other things, it is hypocritically asserted that the Republican Party is "an instrument for good government which it is wicked to destroy," the people should have become dis-trustful and suspicious with regard to the action of the national committee in all the contests yet to be decided, and the Ninth Alabama was only the start. But I am determined upon pitting the truth against that suspicion with a view to eradicating it at least from the minds of all those who are able and willing to read, and, therefore, I propose to discuss all the contests included in the so-called "purging resolution."

ARIZONA.

In the Arizona case the seats of the six Taft delegates at large were contested on the ground of a rump convention having been held by the Roosevelt adherents in a corner of the same hall in which the regular convention was taking place. The rump convention was attended by 25 delegates, while 64 delegates remained in the regular or Taft convention. Although there had been contests in Maricopa and other counties, only one such contest was presented to the State committee when it made up the temporary roll. This was from Cochise County, and it was decided to seat both delegations with one-half vote each, with the understanding that both delegations should present their case to the committee on credentials when appointed by the convention. In the State convention the Taft men were in control by a large majority, but the moment the temporary chairman had taken his seat a number of persons, including about 17 whose names were on the temporary roll, pushed to the right-hand side of the hall, one of their number mounted the platform, and after 15 or 20 minutes of noise and confusion they left the hall and did not return. The Arizona contest is

the result of the proceedings so conducted during that space of time. The record of this so-called convention showed the appointment and report of committees and the election of delegates to the national convention, but it was conceded that these reports, including that of the committee on credentials, had been prepared in advance. In other words, the Roosevelt people knew they would be in a minority in the convention and had staged and prepared for the bolt in advance. The regular convention remained in session for several hours longer and transacted its business in a legal and proper way, not even forgetting vote of thanks to the citizens of Tucson who had arranged for the entertainment of the first Republican convention in the new State. Is there any one who doubts the correctness of the decision of the national committee that this convention was the only regular and legal convention held in the State of

ARKANSAS.

Mr. Roosevelt's list of "stolen delegates" also contains the two delegates from the fifth district of Arkansas. This contest was, as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] properly characterized it, a joke and a farce. Four years ago the national committee decided which faction represented the regular organization in that district, and as no appeal was taken to the committee on credentials, that decision remained in force. The organization so recognized was practically the only one in existence; it put congressional candidates in the field in 1908 and 1910, maintained county committees, and on May 6, 1912, held its regular district convention at Little Rock to again nominate a candidate for Congress and elect two delegates to the national convention. All its proceedings were in due and regular form, and the one contest presented was settled by seating both delegations with a half vote each. In the meantime it seems the old defunct organization, called the Redding faction, had been resurrected to secure two Roosevelt delegates, and it held a "convention" on the same day and also at Little Rock but in another hall. Only three days' notice had been given of the convention, and there was not a little to the convention and there was not a little to the convention and the convention are convention and the convention and the convention are convention. given of the convention, and there was no evidence as to how many delegates attended it and whether they were Republicans. The national committee reaffirmed its decision of four years ago and recognized the two Taft delegates elected by the regular organization. CALIFORNIA.

If noise were a test of merit, the protest of the Californians against the two Taft delegates from San Francisco might be adjudged as valid. The Roosevelt delegation from California, including several Democrats and led by a former Democrat and up to the Chicago convention an alleged Republican, the fireeating governor of that State, certainly made a desperate attempt to carry the day by physical effort rather than by convincing argument. The facts in the case are as plain as daylight. It was anticipated that President Taft would carry the San Francisco district for several reasons, but especially because of his support of that city as the location for the Panama Exposition. In order to head off this Taft victory and to steal the district, as one of the Taft men put it, a law was rushed through the legislature seeking to enforce the State unit rule. In the fourth district the two candidates on the Taft ticket expressed a preference for Taft, but did not agree, the law permitting such discretion, to vote for the candidate receiving the highest vote in the State. At the election they received a majority of 300 over the Roosevelt delegates in the district. The national call expressly forbade any law or the acceptance of any law which prevented the election of delegates by districts, hence the California statute was passed in direct violation of the party law which, in accordance with the principle of home rule, recognizes the district as the unit and has been in vogue ever since 1880.

The California law was passed, was it not, after the national committee had issued its call and had laid down rules under which these delegates should be elected?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes; it was passed for the purpose of getting these California districts which they knew would be for

Mr. AUSTIN. Before the gentleman passes from that, is it not a fact that in a previous national convention this very issue was fought out and delegates representing every State in the Union decided that the delegates from a district could not be elected by the State convention?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. True; that was the convention of 1880. It is a well-settled fact that a State has no power to prescribe the manner of representation in the national convention of a voluntary party organization. If the authority of tion of a voluntary party organization. law were to be recognized at all to control national party conventions, it would have to be the authority of national law. Under a strict construction of its call the national committee could have unseated all 24 Roosevelt delegates, but, instead of

taking advantage of a technicality, it admitted them together with the two Taft delegates from the fourth district, and the seating of the latter was in strict accordance with the law and precedent established in 1880 and followed in unbroken line ever since.

Mr. WARBURTON. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I wish the gentleman would not interrupt me now

Mr. WARBURTON. He has been interrupted by other gentlemen, and I would like to have the same privilege.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I thought we would fight it out on

Washington.

Mr. WARBURTON. You said it had always been the rule. I want to say the State of Washington has always elected its

delegates at large, and they have always been seated.

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to ask the gentleman if there is any controversy or question over them?

Mr. WARBURTON. I do not think so.

Mr. MANN. Did they not once elect their Members of Congress at large?

Mr. WARBURTON. Up until about eight years ago.
Mr. BARTHOLDT. If that is the case, they surely have departed from this rule at this particular time, because at the meeting of the national committee of which I speak the Roosevelt people from Washington made a fight with respect to the delegates at large, eight in number, and they also made a fight with respect to the delegates from the first, second, and third districts of Washington.

Mr. WARBURTON. I would like to ask the gentleman a

question there. In the third district of Washington, in accordance with the report and rule of the State committee, eastern Washington had four Roosevelt delegates to Taft's one, and yet you seated in some manner-I do not know how-the two delegates from that district.

INDIANA.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. In the thirteenth district of Indiana the two Roosevelt contestants based their claims upon a rump convention which was held by a few Roosevelt followers, not more than 30 in number, after the regular convention had been in session three and one-half hours and had transacted its business and adjourned. At this rump convention there was no roll call of the delegates, the persons present did not sit down, no secretary was elected, but a self-appointed chairman, by viva voce vote, declared the election of two delegates and two alternates to the national convention. The regular convention had been riotous, and the confusion and uproar was kept up by the Roosevelt men for more than three hours. They resorted to these tactics after a Taft man had been elected permanent chairman by a very close vote, 711 to 701. This vote had been taken while the proceedings were still orderly, and it was a test vote favoring the Taft side. A dispute about the selection of the member from Fulton County for the committee on credentials was the signal for the "rough house" to be started, but during the confusion the report of the committee on credentials was adopted and the Taft delegates were elected. For 15 minutes the chairman, with a loud voice and through a megaphone, had called upon the Roosevelt men to make nominations for delegates, but none were announced. When the ayes and noes were called on the election of the delegates there were no noes, the Roosevelt delegates failing or refusing to vote. followed, and the rump convention already described was held. A quorum of the convention was 72, the rump convention was attended by not more than 30 delegates. At the hearing before the national committee a new kind of evidence was presented by counsel for the Roosevelt contestants, namely, affidavits purporting to show that a majority of the convention had not voted for the Taft delegates. But as the result of the vote had not been questioned at the convention, the national committee, while permitting the affidavits to be read, declined to recognize them as valid evidence on the ground that duly declared and certified convention results must stand if no question was raised in the convention itself. This contest was decided for Taft, and I believe properly, by a vote of 36 to 14.

KENTUCKY.

The next on the Roosevelt list of "stolen" delegates are those from the seventh, eighth, and eleventh districts of Kentucky. The contest of the delegates at large of that State had been abandoned by the Roosevelt people after it had been shown before the national committee that if all the contested seats in the State convention—449 in number—had been given to Roosevelt, his strength in the convention would have still been 297 votes short of a majority. The test vote of the convention was taken on the adoption of the report of the committee on credentials, the vote being 1,872 to 434 in favor of Taft. There was no protest or bolt of any description. The contest filed as an afterthought is on a par with the fake contests from the other Southern States.

As to the seventh and eighth districts I adopt as my views the statements prepared by counsel at the request of the national committee. They are as follows: "In the seventh Kentucky district the total vote of the convention was 145. There were contests from four counties, involving 95 votes. According to the rules of the party in Kentucky, where two sets of credentials are presented, those delegates whose credentials are approved by the county chairman are entitled to participate in the temporary organization. On the temporary roll the Taft chairman was elected by 98 votes and 47 votes were cast for The committee on credentials was the Roosevelt candidate. then appointed, consisting of one member named by each county delegation. The majority report of the committee was adopted unanimously by the convention, no delegation whose seats were contested being permitted to vote on its own case. As soon as the majority report of the credentials committee had been adopted the Roosevelt adherents bolted. There was not the slightest reason for sustaining the contest for the Roosevelt delegates.

The eighth Kentucky district was composed of 10 counties, having 163 votes, of which 82 were necessary to a choice. There was no contest in 5 of the counties, and, although the Roosevelt men claimed that there was one in Spencer County, no contest was presented against the seating of the regularly elected Taft delegates from that county. This gave the Taft delegates 84 votes, or 2 more than were necessary for a choice. In other words, assuming that the Roosevelt men were entitled to all the delegates from the counties in which they filed contests in the district convention, there remained a clear majority of uncontested delegates who voted for the Taft dele-

gates to Chicago.

The contest in the eleventh district of Kentucky resulted in a compromise, the national committee placing one Taft and one Roosevelt man on the temporary roll of the convention. The decision was reached because there was an honest doubt in the minds of the members. The whole trouble in the district convention arose over the arbitrary action of the chairman of the congressional committee, a Roosevelt man, who called the convention to order and, in violation of all party law and custom, appointed a committee on credentials himself, instead of permitting the delegations from the several counties to name the members. This caused the Taft men to hold a separate convention, with 284 lawfully elected delegates out of a total membership of 384. The national committee would have been justified in seating both Taft men, and yet it is said they were stealing" delegates.

MICHIGAN.

In the "purging resolution" presented to the national convention the Roosevelt contingent also claimed the six delegates at large from Michigan for their chieftain. That contest, after it had been decided by the national committee in favor of the Taft delegates by a viva voce vote, was not even presented to the committee on credentials or the convention. It was too plain a case. The first roll call in the State convention resulted in 67 votes for the Roosevelt side and 818 for Taft. There were contests from Wayne and Calhoun Counties, but when the State committee made up the temporary roll the Roosevelt people failed to present their cases. They also failed to appear before the committee on credentials, although ample opportunity was given them to present their claims. The evidence left no doubt that the Taft men had carried Detroit (Wayne County) by a large majority, but even subtracting from the total vote of the convention the vote of the two contested counties, the delegates still outnumbered the Roosevelt men by several hundred. As was their tactics everywhere in the country, the Roosevelt delegates made all the noise possible, but finally they grew tired and bolted the convention with not to exceed 200 out of a total of 1,312. At all times until the adjournment of the convention nearly 1,000 delegates were present and participated in the proceedings of the election of the six delegates at large. What, I ask, is your opinion of the mental condition or the moral make-up of a man who, in the face of these facts, brazenly sticks to his assertion that these six delegates were stolen by the national committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri

has expired.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, can not I have a little

How much more time does the gentleman desire? Mr. BARTHOLDT. I think I can finish in about 15 minutes.
Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman
from Missouri have 30 minutes more.
Mr. BARTHOLDT. Thank you.

Mr. ROBINSON. The gentleman states that he can conclude in 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. ROBINSON. Reserving the right to object, I would suggest to the gentleman that he take the 15 minutes

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not object to my

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Let me conclude.
Mr. ROBINSON. I will not object.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bartholdt] have 30 minutes. Is there objection? [After a The Chair hears none.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I will ask the gentleman if it did not also clearly appear that if the Roosevelt delegates had been seated from the counties of Calhoun and Wayne that there still would have been a majority in the convention for Taft?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes; and I am also going to show that

in my statement.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Is not the gentleman mistaken as to the total number of delegates to the Michigan conven--1.800?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That was the number of delegates who were entitled to seats in the convention.

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan. I think you are mistaken as to the total number. It was 1,218. You are 500 to high.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. I think the gentleman is mistaken, and I think it ought to be corrected.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I am glad the gentleman calls my attention to it. It is evidently a misprint. I shall make the correction. But that does not change in any way the argument.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. It does not change the result of your reasoning in this respect.

OKLAHOMA.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. In the third Oklahoma district the chairman of the district committee was a Roosevelt man by the name of W. S. Cochran. He knew the committee stood 12 for Taft and 7 for Roosevelt, and so when the 19 members met to make up the temporary roll of the convention Cochran attempted to prevent the majority from taking action.

Mr. AUSTIN. That was the name of the chairman?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That was the name of the chairman.

Although the convention was to meet at 11 o'clock, he arbitrarily announced the committee adjourned until 1.30 p. m. and walked out with six of his henchmen. A motion to depose the chairman was then made and received 11 votes, a majority, and this majority then elected a new chairman and proceeded to transact the business before the committee. The convention was duly called to order on the temporary roll prepared by the congressional committee, which roll was made permanent, whereupon the two Taft delegates to Chicago were duly elected. Every county in the district was represented and voted in the regular convention. Cochran held a bolting convention in another hall, whose membership was largely made up of bystanders and idlers without credentials from any county in the district. I almost feel like apologizing to the House for taking up so much time with the discussion of contests as flimsy and frivolous as this one, but it forms part of the ground upon which the Roosevelt claims are based. I ask you, was there any alternative for the national committee but to sustain the action of the regular convention?

TENNESSEE.

In the second Tennessee district, so ably represented by my friend Mr. Austin, there were 59 delegates uncontested out of a possible total of 108 in the convention. There were 49 contested. The Roosevelt contestants in the 49 refused to abide the decision of the committee on credentials and with-drew, leaving 59 uncontested delegates. These 59, a number of whom were Roosevelt men, remained in the convention, appointed the proper committees, settled contests, and proceeded to select Taft delegates. A few bolters held a meeting which they styled a convention and elected Roosevelt delegates, but being doubtful themselves about the legality of their procedure they unearthed the skeleton of a defunct committee which years before had been declared irregular, and by this means held another convention in which only a few counties were represented and which selected as delegates two men who had taken part in the regular convention formerly held.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the gentleman will permit me, I will state that a majority of the uncontested Roosevelt delegates participated in the convention that elected the two Taft delegates. They refused to go into the other, or Roosevelt, convention.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I am glad the gentleman made that state-

ment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman permit me there, in order that we may get all the facts in reference to that contest? The old committee, twice repudiated at the polls by the people and by the Republican national congressional committee, was revived. It is composed of a membership of 10, and of the 10 members 4, I understand, met and issued a call for the second convention, and of the 10 counties composing the second congressional district there were only 4 that held county conventions to send delegates to the second convention, and of the 4 counties, the largest being Knox County, the Taft men cap-tured that convention and by a vote of about 250 to 25 refused to send delegates to the second convention.

Before I close I want to say this, that when this contest was

presented to the committee on credentials

Mr. HOWARD. I will ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Austin] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bar-THOLDY] to speak a little louder. The tale of this rascality at Chicago is very interesting and we would like to hear it on this

When this second-district contest was pre sented to the committee on credentials at Chicago, having 18 Roosevelt men on it, I insisted upon a roll call, and of the 18 Roosevelt men on the committee on credentials only 6 voted to seat the two Roosevelt delegates from the second district of

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes. Then, in the gentleman's judgment, the action of the national committee in seating these two Taft

delegates was legal and correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. Not only that, but some of the leading Roosevelt members on that committee-Gen. Capers, of South Carolina; Mr. Heney, of California; Senator Kenyon, of Iowa; and Mr. Kellogg, of Minnesota, who held proxies, as I am reliably informed, stated that they voted to seat the two Taft delegates from that district.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That is true. That statement I can con-

firm from personal knowledge.

Mr. AUSTIN. And this was one of the cases in which the minority submitted a report to the convention, in which they claimed that these two delegates were stolen from the Roosevelt people.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes. There was not the shadow of a doubt about the validity and regularity of the first convention, and the national committee so decided by a viva voce vote.

In the ninth Tennessee district there are two organizations, one of which elected Taft, the other Roosevelt delegates. The Taft committee, however, had been recognized by the State committee as the regular organization and it was the one whose candidate for Congress had received a much larger vote than the candidate of the other faction. The national committee decided in favor of the regular convention and its delegates.

By far the most interesting contests were those from the State of Texas, where for the last 10 years a political boss had maintained an oligarchy of officeholders. Nearly every one of these officeholders owes his appointment to the influence of the boss, the national committeeman and the chairman of the State committee, all combined in the one person of Col. Cecil Lyon. Under Mr. Lyon's leadership the Republican vote in the State has dwindled from 167,000 in 1896 to 26,000 in 1910, and this demoralization of the party seems to have suited the boss, as it exempted the party from a State primary law, applicable to parties casting over 100,000 votes, and thus tended to tighten the grip of a political despotism.

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BARTHOLDT. No; I prefer to go on now.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I can not yield for lack of time. must go on.

Mr. WARBURTON. But you have yielded to other gentlemen, and I simply ask you to yield to me now.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I can not yield now. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. This condition of affairs prompted the national committee to look more closely into political conditions and, particularly, the methods pursued in the election of the delegates to the national convention, and it must be a matter of intense gratification to every good Republican that at last this important work was undertaken. The results of the investigation were astounding. It was found that in 99 out of the 249 counties there was no Republican organization, yet each single one was voted in the State convention upon proxies which the postmasters had sent to Mr. Lyon. Naturally it was an easy matter for the boss to control every State convention by means of those bogus proxies when the total vote of the convention was only 248. Lyon and his machine were for Roose-

velt and called themselves "regular"; but if the word is appli-

cable at all, it is clearly an illegal regularity.

The national committee decided-and both the committee on credentials and the convention sustained the decision-that these 99 counties in which the Republican vote was but 2,000 and in which there was no Republican Party, no convention, no primary, no organization, was not the proper source for a proxy to give a vote equal to that to be cast by the other 146 counties in which primaries and conventions were held by regular Republican organizations. These proxies were therefore held to be illegal and not the basis for proper representation. It was decided to deduct the 99 votes from the total of 245 and give the representation to those who controlled the majority of the remainder. The remainder was 152 votes, and out of that the Taft men had carried 89 counties having 90 votes. This gave to the Taft men a clear majority in the State convention, and with it 8 delegates at large to the national convention.

The contests from nine Texas districts in which either the Taft or the Roosevelt men were contestants were heard separately by the committee, and close attention was given by all the members in order that exact justice might be done.

The Taft delegates from the first district were seated by a unanimous vote; hence it is unnecessary to go into details. The Roosevelt members on the committee, in other words, conceded the election of the Taft men, but Mr. Roosevelt insists that the delegates were "stolen."

In the second district, too, the Taft delegates were seated without a division being asked for by the Roosevelt members of the national committee. The convention which elected the Taft delegates was held to have been the regular one.

The contest in the fourth district was also decided in favor of the Taft delegates without a division. The convention which elected them was composed of practically all the regu-The convention

larly elected delegates.

In the fifth district the Roosevelt chairman refused to entertain a minority report touching the basis of representation in the convention. He abandoned the platform and left the hall, seeing that the majority was against him. Thereupon the convention went through its regular business and two Taft delegates were elected, by a vote of 8 to 3, according to county representation. The Roosevelt men later held a meeting, but the national committee recognized the regular convention and not the bolt of a minority.

In the seventh district there are four counties without proper party organization. Col. Lyon had assumed to appoint county chairmen in two of them, but the executive committee, meeting at Galveston prior to the convention, refused to recognize the delegates from any of those unorganized counties. Thereupon one delegate from Fulton County and the alleged representatives of the unorganized counties held a bolting convention, which the national committee refused to recognize.

In the eighth district convention a split occurred over the majority and minority reports of the executive committee as to the temporary roll. The Roosevelt followers controlled the executive committee, but did not have a majority in the convention, which adopted the minority report and gave Taft 51 votes and Roosevelt 21 votes. This resulted in the election of the Taft delegates, who were seated by the national committee.

In the ninth district the chairman of the committee refused to call a meeting because he claimed his superior, Col. Lyon, had directed that all district delegates should be elected by the State convention. Thereupon a Mr. Speaker, a member of the committee, called a meeting, attended by seven members, which issued a call for a district convention to be held May 15. Eleven counties out of fifteen responded to the call and took part in the convention, three being unrepresented. Taft delegates were elected. Then the chairman, having changed his mind, also called a meeting of the committee, and at that meeting a congressional convention was called, to meet on May 18. But the call was not properly published, and therefore the committee decided that the regularity was on the side of the Taft convention.

In the tenth district the undisputed evidence indicated that a flagrant attempt had been made to deprive Taft of this district, to which he was justly entitled. Two members of the district committee had acted in bad faith in the seating of delegates, and one of them misused the proxy intrusted to him. The Taft delegates therefore organized another convention, with delegates from six counties, which transacted its business in a legal and proper way. The Taft delegates were seated, and the case was not appealed to the committee on credentials, When the committee of the fourteenth district met at San

Antonio there were 10 members present whose right to act was undisputed. Six of them were for Taft and 4 for Roosevelt.

There were 4 other Roosevelt men present who were clearly not entitled to act, 1 of them holding the proxy of a dead man and the other 3 being postmasters who, under the law of Texas, could not serve as members of any political committee. There was a contest from Bexar County, which contains the city of San Antonio, but the testimony was overwhelming that Taft had carried that county by nearly 5 to 1. On the proper basis the total vote in the district convention was 67, of which the number instructed or voting for Taft was 371, the number voting or instructed for Roosevelt 28½, not voting 1. Therefore, the Taft delegation was seated by the national committee.

WASHINGTON.

The claim to the delegates at large of the State of Washington was looked upon by the Roosevelt people as their star contest, and I remember well how they cast triumphant glances over to the Taft members while counsel was presenting their side of the controversy. But I also remember how completely crushed was their spirit and what pitiful pictures of collapsed human specimens they presented after the counsel for the Taft side, a brilliant attorney, by the way, had finished his argument. He had left nothing of the Roosevelt case but a memory, and when the committee gave the 14 delegates (the 8 at large and 6 from districts having been consolidated) by a viva voce vote to Taft the Roosevelt adherents, instead of raising the anticipated howl about robbery and theft, meekly took their hats, as adjournment immediately followed, and noiselessly left the hall, together with the Taft members.

Having taken a seat in the front row I was careful that not a particle of the evidence from either side escaped my attention. The majority in the State convention depended upon the recognition of either the Taft and Roosevelt delegates from Seattle

or King County

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. No. There can not be any contention

about this. I am stating only the facts.

Mr. WARBURTON. I wanted to suggest one or two things in connection with it.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. When I get through I will give the gentleman the floor; when I get through with the State of Wash-

ington, I mean.

The contention of the Roosevelt people was that the county committee had ordered a primary at which their delegates had been elected by about 6,900 votes, that the primary had been properly called and that its result made theirs the legal delegation. The facts, however, as developed by undisputed evidence, were as follows: Under the State law of Washington county committees have the power to either select delegates directly or to call primaries for the purpose. In King County (Seattle) the committee consisted of 250 men from 250 precincts, the majority of whom were for Taft, and that majority, acting through its executive committee, selected the Taft delegates to the State convention.

Mr. WARBURTON. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the

gentleman there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?
Mr. BARTHOLDT. I am stating absolute facts and I do not want to be interrupted. I am stating facts that can not be disputed by anybody

Mr. WARBURTON. I am undertaking to dispute the facts stated by the gentleman, which I know to be untrue.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri refuses to

yield.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Meantime the city council of Seattle, by redistricting the city, had increased the number of pre-cincts from 250 to 381, but at a general meeting of the county committee it was resolved that representatives to fill the 131 new precincts should not be selected until an election was held in September, 1912. In spite of this conclusion, the Roosevelt chairman of the committee who had himself presided at that meeting and not dissented, assumed the right to appoint 131 new committeemen, and with those voting it was claimed a primary was ordered. And remember that this was long after the committee had already selected the delegates to the State convention. Even the fact of the primary having been ordered is strongly questioned, because of the confusion prevailing at the meeting, but this is unimportant in view of the illegal action of the chairman.

The Taft men protested against this high-handed proceeding of constituting an illegal majority and refused to take part in the primary at which, as a consequence, only 3,000 votes out of a total Republican vote of 70,000 were cast, according to the newspapers. The national committee held, and properly so, that it was beyond the power of the chairman to add 131 precinct men to the old committee; as his authority to fill vacancies applied only to such places which became vacant after they had been filled. The fact is that nearly all precincts had been changed; consequently if the 131 new precincts were to be filled the entire number of 381 precincts must be filled. When the King County contest reached the State convention, the State committee, in preparing the temporary roll, decided that the Seattle primary election was irregular and illegal and seated the Taft delegates, whereupon the Roosevelt men bolted and held a separate convention. This is the much-advertised Washington contest in a nutshell. It is the duty of the national committee to sustain party regularity and legality in the selection of delegates. What else, I ask you, was there for them to do than to seat the Taft delegates from Washington?

Mr. AUSTIN. Before the gentleman leaves the consideration of the Washington contest will be yield to me for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield? Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Just in order to clear up a matter. When the gentleman was discussing the California case and the irregular action of the Roosevelt people in selecting all the delegates from the State at large, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WARBURTON] said that the custom in the State of Washington was to elect all the delegates from the State at large and not from the districts. I wish to state that I have examined the Congressional Directory for 1904, just prior to the Republican national convention of eight years ago, and the Congressional Directory just prior to the national convention of 1908, and it appears from this record that every Congressman from the State of Washington was elected from the State at large and not from districts, and hence under the call it was right and proper and in line with the action and the practice of the national committee to elect all delegates from the State of Washington in 1904 and 1908 from State conventions and not from district conventions.

Mr. WARBURTON. I am not quite certain, but I think about

eight years ago that was the case.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I decline to yield further. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri declines

to yield.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I want to say, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Warburton], propounded a little while ago, and in answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Austin], that so far as the merits of this contest are concerned, it is absolutely im-material how those delegates are elected. The manner of their selection, by districts or by the State convention, has nothing

to do with the merits of this case.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; but the point that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WARBURTON] was endeavoring to make was that in the discussion of the California case the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bartholdt] was stating that the people of California had no right, in violation of the call of the national committee, to elect all the delegates in the State at large. Then the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WARBURTON] called attention to the fact that in his State it had been customary to elect them all from the State at large, and not from districts; and in answer to his statement I call attention to the fact that there were no districts in the State of Washington, but under that call it was their duty, and the only way, to elect delegates from Washington from the State at large and not by districts.

Mr. WARBURTON. Certainly, the gentleman will yield to

me now, just at that point?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I can not yield.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not yield.
Mr. WARBURTON. As a matter of fact, the gentleman does not want to yield to me at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri declines to

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bartholdt] says he declines to yield, and the gentleman from Washington

[Mr. Warburton] makes an assault upon him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bartholdt] has the floor. If a gentleman on the floor is interrupted and the gentleman making the interruption does not address the Chair, and the gentleman on the floor permits the interruption, the Chair is powerless.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, this completes my review of the contests. It shows conclusively that every one of the 72 delegates whose right to seats in the convention is questioned by Mr. Roosevelt was honestly seated and justly titled to take part in the work of the national convention as a legal representative of the Republicans of his State or dis-

trict. The decision of the national committee was in each single instance sustained by a two-thirds majority of the committee on credentials appointed by the convention, and finally by the convention itself. Since the convention has spoken and assumed responsibility, the scurrilous charges hurled against the national committee really signify a wholesale indictment against the Republican Party itself; hence the Republican who, with the record before him and in spite of it, continues to talk of "tainted delegates" and an "illegal nomination" is no longer attacking individuals, but is befouling his own nest. And more than that. A careful scrutiny of that record will convince him that if he wishes to leave the Republican Party he must leave it for other reasons than the malicious slanders about "stolen delegates," for, readily assuming the burden of proof, that party has successfully and forever purged itself of that infamous charge. It has bravely faced a great crisis, perhaps the greatest in its wonderful history, and forcing into the open and vanquishing its detractors and secret enemies, it was able, with providential aid, to emerge from the depth of distress with immaculate hands, a clear conscience, and a beneficent new-born program vouchsafing to the American people, as a logical sequence of its glorious record, progress and peace, protection and prosperity. Is there a true Republican in the land who will not heartily rejoice at this great moral victory?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall not refer to the slurs of men who have grown tired of their party affiliation, and who, if "convinced against their will, would be of the same opinion still," nor shall I take notice of the unjust denunciations audaciously reiterated on this floor a few days ago to appease a troubled conscience, but I do deem it proper and timely to throw some light on the political situation by examining the fingers which are trying to throttle the Republican Party. When we are unjustly assailed we have a right not only to defend ourselves, but to inquire into the motives of the assailants. Let me open up the inquiry with this question: Do you believe the national committee would have devoted 10 days to their most painstaking and exhausting work if they could have realized that there was to be but one real Republican candidate before the convention? Many delegates had their misgivings at the time. They remembered that in the widely advertised Columbus speech the name Republican was not even mentioned, but they still felt confident that no man would have the audacity to ask for a presidential nomination at the hands of a Republican national convention when at heart he was no longer a Republican. In the light of later events we know, of course, that this was a case of mis-placed confidence, in other words, that Mr. Roosevelt never intended to abide by the decision of the convention except he himself would be the nominee. We know now that it was an ordinary holdup, not even without the customary threat "Your purse or your life!" "Give me the nomination or I'll kill you." Yes, and we can go further and say, when the third-term candidate made up his mind to violate all American traditions of political decency and go to Chicago, at that very moment he knew he was beaten, but expected to save the day by personal appeals to the delegates through persuasion, promises, coercion, or threats.

But he came with treachery in his heart and fully determined to bolt if things went against him, hence we are forced to the conclusion that, whatever its decisions on the contests, the national committee would have been condemned in any event except these decisions had resulted in his nomination. The cry of fraud was premeditated, and the shameless ejaculation "Thieves!" with which he shocked his audience on his entrance into Chicago was the battle cry of the new party. There could be no other, for principles and policies were forgotten, and if himself nominated, believe me, he would have made the race on any old platform, with his frantic followers shouting "Hosanna!" There was no more effective means to undermine the old party than to defame its character. In order to put a new party on its feet it became necessary to run down the old one. Certainly no sane citizen will desert his party and all its happy associations as long as he has confidence in it, hence that confidence had to be destroyed. What was there more convenient than to seize upon the contests as the handlest "big stick" for the work of destruction? If the national committee had heeded the injunction "Thou shalt not steal except for me!" all would have been well, but its determination to do its work conscientiously brought all the prearranged plans of party treachery to full fruition. A new party was born, but is it not bound to be stillborn? Can a party live or ought it to live when its birthright is a lie?

The national committee is not entitled to any credit for the faithful performance of its duty, but I predict that the time will come when the people will thank God its members could not be swayed by popular clamor and had the courage to settle

all controversies strictly in accordance with the facts and the evidence

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is for you and not for me to say whether in my 20 years of service in this House I have established a reputation for veracity, but from a most intimate knowledge of the facts and the evidence I again assert upon my personal honor and I am willing to reiterate it before my Maker that there was not a single delegate in the Chicago convention who was not fairly entitled to a seat therein, and that consequently President Taft was honestly nominated. [Applause on the Republican side.]

During the delivery of the foregoing, The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again exnired.

Mr. MANN. I ask that the gentleman may have 15 minutes. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may have 15 Is there objection? minutes more.

Mr. ROBINSON. Reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire how much time has been allotted for this general de-

Mr. MANN. Until half past 3 o'clock.

Mr. ROBINSON. I understand there are gentlemen on this side of the House who wish to speak.

Mr. MANN. I think all gentlemen on that side have been arranged for.

Mr. ROBINSON. I will not object.

Mr. W. RBURTON. The gentleman has refused to allow me to interrupt him, and I will object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. MANN. I Lope the gentleman from Washington will not do that.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I am perfectly willing to yield to the gentleman from Washington at the end of my remarks. told the gentleman I would be willing to yield to him then.

Mr. WARBURTON. Let the gentleman proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington withdraws his objection.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, how long has the gentleman from Missouri been addressing the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied the time of the House for an hour and a half.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. And we vote at half past 3? Mr. MANN. We do not vote at half past 3, but the general debate will be closed at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order which has been agreed

to, the general debate closes at half past 3.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Robinson] stated the proposition correctly when he said that there were a number of gentlemen on this side of the aisle who wished to speak this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has been approached by several gentlemen who desire time. The Chair states that in an-

swer to the inquiry of the gentleman.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Do I understand that the extension of the time of the gentleman from Missouri for 15 minutes will shut out any gentleman on this side of the House? The CHAIRMAN. It will certainly consume that much of

the remaining time.

Mr. JAMES. I understand the unanimous consent has been given.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. No; I am withholding my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. WARBURTON] withdrew his objection. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BARTHOLDT resumed and concluded his remarks.] Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, for the last few days I have been listening with a great deal of interest to the distinguished gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber in their efforts to justify the conduct of the present administration in the procurement of delegates at Chicago and also other gentlemen in their attempt to justify the conduct of another candidate who sought to procure delegates at Chicago.

When the American people first saw in the public press the reports of the outrageous conduct being carried on at Chicago in the struggle for these delegates they were slow to believe that any such conduct could take place between two men with such distinguished careers as the present President of the United States and the ex-President. For myself, I did not want to believe that such conduct could take place in any convention or in any assemblage in the United States of America. At first I did not believe all of the press reports of the conduct carried on there. But since the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Mondell], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Norris], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT], and other gen-

tlemen on the other side have stood up here on the floor of this House with carefully prepared manuscripts and verified every statement made by the papers as to the conduct and the practices of the "machines" in their efforts to procure dele-gates at Chicago and those individuals who were in charge of the campaigns of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft, of course I can no longer say that I do not believe those reports.

Gentlemen on that side of the Chamber say that Mr. Taft bought or stole his renomination. I do not believe he did anything of the sort. I do not believe he bought his delegates with money. I can not believe that such corrupt practices as that would be used by a President of the United States. not believe that these gentlemen on the other side ought to make a scapegoat of the negro delegates from the South. rise in my place to defend the Georgia nigger as much as any-

thing else. [Applause.]

They say on that side that these delegates were of a questionable honesty, that these conventions held in Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas were irregular conventions. Why, Mr. there was nothing irregular about them. were conducted in the same way that the Republican Party has been treating the negro in the South ever since the war. got these delegates to Chicago by the same well-oiled machine that they have been using ever since the days of reconstruction-by the Federal patronage route.

Now, I say they did not buy these delegates, and they did not have to steal them, for no man can commit a larceny upon his own property. Mr. Taft's managers had nothing to do with that; but I will tell you how they got them and how they have

been getting them.

As a matter of fact, there are not, never have been, and, thank God, never will be enough Republicans in the State of Georgia or the South to count. The only delegates from Georgia who deserted Taft at Chicago were white delegates. One of those white delegates has held a Republican office for 16 years in the district that I have the honor to represent. has been drawing a salary from the Federal Treasury of \$5,000 a year. He went up to Chicago and he deserted the President, and went into the convention and voted for the gentleman who recently emerged from the jungles of Africa dragging a he tiger by the tail and a bull elephant by the snout. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, there must be some reason for a man of the intelligence of this man voting for Mr. Roosevelt, and I will tell you why he did it. I know him personally. He voted for Roosevelt because he knew that the election of Mr. Taft was absolutely impossible in November, he had nothing to lose, and he was out on a limb and it did not make much difference which way he jumped. He thought that ex-President Roosevelt by going throughout the country proclaiming from every stump that the bosses of this country were ruling it, and that they had the convention packed and stacked against him would make the American people listen to him, and that probably he would stand a chance of election. But now he has ruined his chances for election by going up here to Pittsburgh and selecting a manager and side partner, the man who did the work for him in Pennsylvania; and who did he get? He got a man by the name of Bill Flinn. I was in Pittsburgh in 1907 upon a visit. They carried me away upon a hill where the aristocrats live, and they pointed out to me a residence and they would say, that is owned by Mr. So-and-so, he is worth one hundred millions; he made it in steel. Then they would point out another one and say, that man is worth fifty millions, and he made it in steel.

Mr. BUCHANAN. S-t-e-a-1?
Mr. HOWARD. S-t-e-a-1 and s-t-e-e-l, both. Finally they came to a magnificent residence and pointed it out to me and said, "That is hog wallow." I said, "What?" They said, "That is hog wallow." I said, "Who lives there?" And they "Bill Flinn, the municipal contract boss of Pittsburgh, there." They said that he was reputed to be worth millives there. lions, and that all of the money that he had made was made out of controlling the contracts for public work in the city of Pittsburgh. Roosevelt has written his O. K. on him, and the Colonel says that he is all right.

Why did Taft and Roosevelt fall out, and what did they fall out about? Just a few months ago they were calling each other "Dear Bill" and "Dear Theodore." They were consulting over the Canadian reciprocity act; they were the best of friends. One was saying what the other did was all right, and the first thing you know they had a fuss, and they fell out and then finally the ex-President said to himself, "I have got to vindicate myself, and the only way I can do it is to run against my good old friend Bill whom I made President three years ago."
So he started out, and the first thing he did when he started out was to abuse the President. The President replied by saying, "I never did do a thing, Theodore, since I have been President, that I have not consulted you about, and you have always approved of everything I did." He further said, "You ought not to fall out with me; you know you made me what I am. But, Mr. Chairman, the Republicans had realized that they had to fool the people, and the best man on this earth to fool them with was the ex-President. They knew that he was the only man living who could rate the millionaire and the pauper side by side and make the pauper believe he loved him better than the millionaire. They thought that probably he could keep the Republican Party together, and if he could not they could have an excuse and go before the country the next session and say, "Well, if it had not been for Taft we would have won," and the Taft followers could say, "If it had not been for that fellow Roosevelt, we would have won." They expected to "come back" four years from now and rehabilitate the Republican Party and get into power again.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in the history of this country that a man like the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Mondell], one of the most distinguished Members of this House and one of the greatest leaders in the Republican Party, has been called upon to get up on the floor of this House and defend a Republican nomination. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] got up and denounced the action of the Taft followers in the late convention, calling them thieves, robbers, and so forth. He then proceeded to defend the action of Mr. Roosevelt at Chicago. Mr. Chairman, I have some information from one of the negro delegates to the effect that if the banks in Chicago and the banks all over this country would keep a sharp lookout they would see passing through their institutions many brand-new \$500 and \$1,000 bills that had been torn exactly in half and neatly pasted together in the middle. The history of these mutilated bills is not only unique but very interesting.

I am told that the bull moose delegate "herders" would approach a poor southern negro and pull from his pocket in a very indifferent manner a large roll of nice, new yellow-backed bills, and say to him, "Ephraim, I want to see you a minute. Ephraim, six of the leading white delegates from your State have come over to us, and they are all going over in the morning. Now is the day of your salvation. If you do not come now, you are going to miss the best opportunity you ever had in your life to get a big pile of money and get on the band wagon at the same time." And with this statement he just wagon at the same time." And with this statement he just tore that thousand dollar bill in two, and the idea of tearing up money before Ephraim shocked his nervous system and he fainted. [Laughter.]

They had money there to tear up, and Ephraim could not and it. When he came to this white man said to him, "Ephraim, you go into the convention in the morning and vote for McGovern, and here is half of this bill, and just as soon as you vote for him I will see that you get the other half." Ephraim did not have much confidence in half a bill, and he thought they were fixing to get him into the penitentiary and refused. He said, "No, boss, I got to see one of the gentlemen here before I do that," and he went to him and told him what had happened, and of course this man told him that he must not do it, and he kept an eagle eye on Ephraim ever afterwards.

This same nigger delegate tells me that another thing happened. The Taft managers had a lot of these Georgia darkies in a large room, called by the Republican managers the "bull pen," and one of them had been giving one excuse after another to get out. Every time he would say he wanted anything, somebody would go and get it for him. They thought the best thing to do was to keep him locked up. Finally he gave a very plausible excuse, and told them that he would not be gone more than about five minutes if they would let him out. They told him to go out and they let him out with a delegate from my district to watch him, but in some way or other in the crowd he evaded this man, and got lost from him and was gone about an hour and a half. He came back somewhat under the influence of what the darkies call down in my State "blue-steel corn. He fell on a cot and soon went to sleep. The official "herder" of these delegates, who was a very smart darky, said that the best thing to do was to search that nigger, for he had been up to some devilment, having been off too long. He was serenely sleeping on this cot and they proceeded to search him, and the first thing they ran across, carefully tied up in a red silk hand-kerchief, was a brand-new \$500 bill, and they took it away from him.

He tells me they have got that bill yet, and the President got his vote the next morning, and you are going to hear from that bill in this campaign, gentlemen, I put you on notice, especially those of you who think your candidate was so saturated with the holy water of Republicanism that he could commit no wrong. Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Did he have both halves?

Mr. HOWARD. This delegate had the whole bill. They bought him lock, stock, and barrel on the spot, and he agreed to deliver the "goods" the next morning. Now, when one of these candidates charges corruption against the other, it is like the pot calling the kettle black. Now, I said in the outset Mr. Taft did not buy his nomination with money.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Do I understand the gentleman from Mr. MONDELL. Georgia intimates the \$500 was paid in whose interest?

Mr. HOWARD. In the interest of the bull moose candi-

Mr. ROBINSON. And in whose interest was the torn bills

given?

Mr. HOWARD. That was in the interest of the bull moose party also, so I am informed. I do not want to whitewash either of your candidates. You gentlemen have been seeking the truth, and it has been left for me to tell the whole truth about that convention, and I am going to give it to you.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman said a good deal about the conduct of the negro delegates at this Republican convention. Does not the gentleman think the negro delegates from the Southern States at this Republican convention behaved themselves about as well and as properly as the same number of white Republicans from the South would have behaved themselves?

Mr. HOWARD. I just stated that the negro delegates to the Republican convention, those who went there for the President and those who went there for Mr. Roosevelt behaved themselves better than the crowd of white men who went there to control them. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. Chairman, I say that the present administration did not-

Mr. MONDELL. Is not it true in spite of temptation-and I judge from what the gentleman says there were some temptations-the colored delegates of the South, practically all of them voted according to their instructions?

Mr. HOWARD. Why, certainly; they had heard their "master's voice" before they left home.

Mr. AUSTIN. How about Banks, a delegate from your

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. What do you mean?

Mr. AUSTIN. Did not he violate his instructions? Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I said the negro delegates

from the South behaved as well as the same number of white Republicans from the South would have behaved. I did not refer to Tennessee-simply in Georgia, Alabama, and those Southern States.

Mr. CONNELL. From the remarks the gentleman from Wyoming made the other day and what we have heard this last week of this particular convention it would appear that there was nobody behaving himself.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the record will show that a greater number of white delegates from the South deserted President Taft than colored delegates. I know of two from the State of Alabama and two from Virginia.

Mr. HOWARD. Did not I say that as plain as I could use

the English language?

Mr. AUSTIN. And the two white men from Alabama were

Mr. PROUTY. I would like to inquire whether the gentleman considers that the colored delegates from the South to the Chicago convention demeaned themselves any better or any worse than the fellows from the South at the Baltimore convention.

Mr. HOWARD. Why, Mr. Chairman, the Baltimore convention was the most harmonious convention ever held in the history of this country. Why, the police force made the nomination at Chicago possible. You Republicans would not have a candidate at all if the police had not have knocked down a delegate every five minutes, while we got together and nominated one of the greatest men this country ever produced to bear the standard of our party, and what we will do to you in November will be a plenty.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield

to the gentleman from Pennsylvania? Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.
Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman wants
to get Pennsylvania into this?
Mr. HOWARD. I do; she is already in it.

State to the Republican convention voted the Republican ticket

at the last general election?

Mr. HOWARD. In answer to that I must confess my ignorance of politics in Mississippi. I do not know what they did there in Mississippi, but I know that Mississippi is represented in this House by her most distinguished citizens, and they can answer any question concerning Mississippi. [Applause.] here to defend the Georgia negro, and that is what I got up for.

Mr. SIMS. My question comes in at that point. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will ask the gentleman about his own State. Can the gentleman indicate any particular precinct in his own district in which these colored Republicans voted at the last election?

Mr. HOWARD. Well, very few of them voted; very few,

indeed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. One more question: Does not the gentleman think it is due to the House and to the country that this \$500 man to whom he refers should be named and

located so that proceedings might be taken-

Mr. HOWARD. I anticipate the question. I think he will be named, and I think some of that crowd over there on your side is going to name him, from what I hear. 'I think one officeholder under the present administration, who, drawing \$5,000 a year from the Federal Treasury, has an affidavit from that man. Why should I become a witness against Republican debauchery in their conventions when we have so many witnesses who have already testified to the truth of the assertions I now make? We do not need to prove these statements. You have confessed to their authenticity.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think it is fair, if he has information of that kind, that he should name the bribers and name the bribee, so that proceedings

might be brought against them?

Mr. HOWARD. You will get all of that. You may hear from that more than from anything else, and from your own crowd,

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is something we want to know. We want to be fair on this side.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman has defended his Georgia negroes and others for not yielding to temptation. I want to ask how they or any other individual can be tested as to temptation when they keep them locked up so nobody can tempt them?

Mr. HOWARD. Well, they have had past experiences at And I suppose at these big conventions, these conventions. where there is so much turmoil and so much money and corruption, the best thing to do is to keep these delegates locked up; and I think it was a wise thing to lock up the Georgia delegates, and the Tennessee delegates, the Mississippi delegates

Mr. AUSTIN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The delegates

from my State were not locked up.

Mr. HOWARD. Well, Mr. Chairman, from the conduct of some of them they ought to have been locked up. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. Chairnan, I have been very liberal in yielding to these gentlemen

Mr. SIMS. May I finish my question? What does the gentleman think of any party that selects delegates to the national convention in whom they have no confidence and have to keep

them under lock and key

Mr. HOWARD. I think that the place for my friend and for me to express any opinion as to that will be on the stump this

Mr. CANNON. What does the gentleman think of any party that allows one man from Nebraska, William J. Bryan, after eight majority votes cast for another candidate, to demand that the majority give way? If the gentleman will address himself to that a little while, he will clean his own house.

Mr. HOWARD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Cannon] that the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Bryan, did exert quite an influence at the Baltimore convention. It is to be expected that any man who has enjoyed the confidence of six millions of American voters would wield a wonderful influence in any convention. Whatever may have been his motives, there are those in our party who give him credit for being absolutely sincere. Of course, Mr. Bryan is . a great statesman; he is very close to the masses of our people; and if we should follow Mr. Bryan we may do right, and you would promptly say that we do wrong. We do not try to please you in our conduct at conventions. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If we tried to please you, we would not have any hope of being in power in November. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Because of the fact that instead of trying to please you we try to please the great masses of the American Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to ask the gentleman one or two questions, if he will permit. Can the gentleman point to any congressional district, precinct, or division in the State of Mississippi in which the colored delegates from that

of what he is going to do, but does it; that man who wears no yoke of a boss; that man who has proven his faith in the masses of the people by placing them in control and overthrowing every man who looks like a boss. While you standpatters and "Bull Moosers" are over there daily shaking your fists in each other's faces, yelling thief, robber, thug, and using sweet and mellifluous epithets.

Now, let us see about the conduct of the present administration at Chicago. I said they did not buy delegates with money. What has been the policy of the Republican Party in the South? You talk about a machine, you talk about crushing the life out of people that do not agree with you; what chance has any candidate of your party in the United States to get a single vote against the administration in power in the South unless they buy them lock, stock, and barrel?

Mr. MANN. If we could get a fair election, we would have many chances.

Mr. HOWARD. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. MANN. I say that if we had a fair election we would

have plenty of chances.

Mr. HOWARD. A fair election? You have not any right to talk about fair elections. [Applause on the Democratic side.]. God in heaven knows if there is anybody on the floor of this House that ought not to talk about popular elections it is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who hails from Chicago.

Mr. MANN. Where the Democrats run the election machinery.

Mr. HOWARD. I want to say a few words as to how these delegates came from the South instructed. I noticed one thing in this campaign, and I expect every Democrat on the floor of this House noticed it, and that was the absence from the councils of the stand-pat Republican Party's advisers of one Hon. Frank H. Hitchcock. The Post Office Department was the delegate machine of this administration. You could not have thrown a pigeon egg on the floor of that convention at Chicago without bursting on the head of a Federal officeholder. Mr. Chairman, I want to say here and now that the conduct carried on in the South in the appointment of postmasters, in the demotion of postal employees, in the promotion of postal employees, is a disgrace to a great Nation like ours. They have taken an honest, faithful public servant, and because of the fact that they could not dictate to that man his political affiliation they have dismissed him from the service on trumped-up charges by what they call "inspectors," or they have demoted him to the extent that his wife and children suffered for bread and he had to leave the postal service.

Now, let us see who these delegates were from the Southern States at Chicago. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] the other day, in giving a list of the delegates there, gave a correct and truthful version of the political status of these delegates in Chicago. Why, I have a Republican white post-master in my district that spells "come" with a "k." He could not write his name so that any man on the floor of this House could read it, unless the Member knew whose signature it was. He is a man who has been noted for nothing else but his great control over the negroes in that particular county. And yet that man is a postmaster in that district, and in a town of over 1,800 inhabitants, and he is left there to wait on my constituents. But he could not do that. He could not make out a receipt for a money order; he could not make out a receipt for a registered letter; and, consequently, the postmaster of this town is his daughter. And this man is one of the bosses down there, and his chief associates are a crowd of these poor, ignorant darkies who believe that they will get something some day at the end of the Republican rainbow.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman allow me?
Mr. HOWARD. I will yield to my colleague.
Mr. ADAMSON. I understand the gentleman to be proceed-

ing with absolute impartiality as against the bull elephant and bull moose?

Mr. HOWARD. Absolutely.
Mr. ADAMSON. And I wish to call your attention to the fact that there must be a mutual misunderstanding between you and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who sought to interrupt you a moment ago. You said they could not procure any delegates from the South without buying them. The gentleman from Illinois said they could if they would give them fair elections. You were talking about the selection of delegates to the Republican convention?

Mr. HOWARD. Certainly.
Mr. ADAMSON. Who is responsible if they do not have fair elections in those sections? Do the apocryphal ballot-box stuffers and bulldozers have anything to do with it?

Mr. HOWARD. Nothing in the world. If you did not get an honorable delegation in Chicago, it is because the honorable Frank Hitchcock snapped a cap and his gun did not

Why, just a day or so before the Chicago convention appointments in the State of North Carolina were sent to the Senate for confirmation by the President. All at once we see him hastily withdraw them. The bull moose had cast his shadow in the old North State. Would these appointees stand the test? The bull moose had cast his shadow Some doubt must have been in the mind of the President. was like the man who approached "Ephraim"; so he decided that it was safer to make these appointments after the convention than before. The goods were delivered, so the appointments were made.

You have got no right to complain about these delegates at Chicago from Georgia or from any other Southern State. already had them. They were bought and paid for with Federal patronage to the great detriment of the postal service of this country; and a long-suffering public has said, "We have got enough of incompetent service, and we are going to put some-body else in your place." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, I say that you bought the Taft delegates with Federal patronage, and there is not a man on that side who will

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to say to the gentleman, if his remarks have reference to delegates from the second district of Tennes-

see, that he is grossly in error.

Mr. HOWARD. At the very outset of my speech I took particular pains to except the second district of Tennessee. [Applause.] No corruption, no taint on honesty, could exist with such a man as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Austin],

who represents that district, living in it. [Applause.]

Oh, no; the gentleman will get right some day. He is engaged in bad business. But I see, sometimes, when the gentleman votes for the Wool Trust and for the Cotton Trust and for all these big octupuses, that he is ashamed of his work. I can see that the gentleman blushes when he does it, but he will get right. Tennessee, unfortunately, split up 50 years ago, and she has been split up ever since. But she is getting nearer and nearer together now, and in a few years the gentleman from Tennessee will look back upon the history of the old second district and say, "My God, what a mistake I did make when I represented that district as a Republican!" [Laughter.] Oh, how prosperous you would be if you were just a Democrat! [Laughter.]

Now, gentlemen laugh over there. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] defended the present administration the other day. I could not help thinking about that distinguished gentleman. How eloquently he pleaded for the administration! He said that everything done at Chicago was perfectly regular and legitimate. The idea of the President of the United States and the men representing him at Chicago stooping to do anything that was not fair! And then I remember how the gentleman pleaded for sheep last summer; how he pleaded for protection on wool; how he talked about the absolute necessity for this outrageous protection on all these woolen goods, and how little he said about the poor, shivering women and children who could not wear a single woolen garment upon their bodies because of the outrageous tax you had helped place upon these great necessities of life. Yet he says that we have got to have honesty and fairness in these elections.

Well, they had it, and I want to say something to the gentle-man from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and to my distinguished friend from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Oh, he is such a progressive Republican. He does progress so much. He is in favor of everything that is along the progressive line. He is like the toad frog that swallowed a buckshot and fell into the well. He progresses by jumping up 2 inches and falling back 4. [Laughter.] He is a great progressive, and he defended the

Now, if I had been the President, I believe if I wanted intellect and brains to defend me on the floor of this House, I would have selected without hesitation the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. Humphrey] and my distinguished friend from St. Louis, Mo. [Mr. Bartholdt]. But if I wanted Republicans with a record on which I would be willing to go before the country and say to the people, "These men, representing me on the floor of the House, have shown by their votes, on one or more occasions at least, that they were willing to give the common people a crumb from the table of protection," I would not select them. For he can not say that about the gentlemen I have re-ferred to. No wall of protection is too high for the gentleman from Wyoming or the gentleman from Washington or the gentleman from Missouri. You can not impose any tax too outrageous on the American people for these three gentlemen to support with all their vigor and all their hearts.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am wandering away from my subject, which is so near and dear to my heart, and that is the Georgia negro. I must not get away from that. [Laughter.]
Mr. BURKE of South Dakota, Mr. Chairman, will the gentle-

man yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. HOWARD. With pleasure, for a question.
Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The gentleman has criticized somewhat a postmaster in his district. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would be in favor of a law providing that postmasters should be selected through the classified service.

Mr. HOWARD. I will say to the gentleman that if I had no hopes of a Democratic administration coming in soon, I would readily agree with him. [Laughter and applause.] But as we Congressmen are going to have something to say as to

agin" changing the law. [Laughter and applause.] Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gen-

tleman yield again?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I want to say to the gentleman that if he has his way some of "we Congressmen" on that side of the House will be with us but a short time.

Mr. HOWARD. I do not think the gentleman is a clairvoyant. do not think the gentlenan has any right to predict such a violent thing as the defeat of the Democratic Party again. Why, my dear sir, your grandchildren will be grayheaded and snaggletoothed before you ever see a Republican again in the White [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, the American people have just got onto your curves.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gen-

tleman again yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. HOWARD. I will yield for a question.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I gather from the gentleman's statement that he has been reading the Congressional Record for several years past, because that statement appears regularly in the RECORD every four years.

Mr. HOWARD. I have never been a plagiarist in my life, and I have never been guilty of it here; and if the gentleman says that statement appears in the Record, I will withdraw it. I am not going to be guilty of what you gentlemen were guilty of in Chicago—stealing—and I will not steal anything, not even a prediction. I will not be guilty of such reprehensible conduct.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. You have been predicting Democratic success for the last 16 years.

Mr. HOWARD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I must close. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rodenberg], in a magnificent memorized speech, to which he devoted a long, long time, got up here the other day and said something about our nominee for Presi-

Of course, he made his case as strong as he could, and what did it amount to? It is all bosh. The people of this country do not believe, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] did not believe that Mr. Wilson ever in his life believed that a Chinaman was better than a Caucasian. But, as I say, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rodenberg] made his case as strong as he could. Like the lawyer in court, with the gallows staring his client in the face, with the rope stretched and the noose made, he made the best appeal he could, and he jumped on the Democratic nominee for President. Now, let us see. Mr. Taft has not written any books. He does not need to write any books. Better than books, his cold-blooded acts in vetoing remedial legislation passed by the first session of the Sixty-second Congress are sufficient to write "No!" on the heart of every struggling American citizen in this country. Mr. Roosevelt has written a good many books. He wrote one in many volumes called the Winning of the West, and if you gentlemen want some campaign thunder you can find it there. no need to use it; you are just wasting your ammunition. But if you want to make a lot of fuss and do a lot of sheeting, just for the sake of keeping up your courage, I remind you that if you peruse Col. Roosevelt's book, the Winning of the West, you will find where he compared the American farmer with the old cowboy of the sixties and seventies; not the cowboy of to-day, but the cowboy of those former days, who carried a pistol and drank liquor and played cards and killed folks and shot out the lights in the small towns, and broke up the grog shops in the villages. Col. Roosevelt said he would rather be "a bronco buster in the West than an American farmer with a dull intellect.

The farmers will appreciate that sort of talk. When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] made his attack upon the present nominee of the Democratic Party he forgot that his champion had already had the Ceath knell sounded for him and that the other man lay down in Hog Wallow, on the hills in Pittsburgh, with old Bill Flinn and has had his campaign financed by that great philanthropist, the man who has always attempted to right the wrongs of every poor man in this country, the man who has always stood ready and willing to come out and say, "Thus far shalt thou go in dealing with the poor men in this country and no further." That man is the Hon. George W. Perkins, the right-hand partner of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, who, I am reliably informed, has underwritten a campaign fund of two and a half million dollars for the bull moose from the jungles with which to run his campaign.

But there is one other gentleman whom we ought not to forget. There is a newspaper published in Washington. It is a great paper. The only thing that I know that commends that paper to me is the fact that it has a mighty clever set of young men employed on it. They are very bright. I do not see how they can write such articles for that paper when they have instructions from their boss to do the very opposite to what their consciences dictate that they should do. But this man is saying all sorts of mean things about the Democratic candidate for the Presidency and about Mr. Taft. Well, he hopes for his reward. It is not money that he wants, because I understand he is worth over \$30,000,000; but it is position that he wants, and I understand that if the bull moose candidate is elected President of the United States he will be the minister to the Court of St. James. So he is turning loose all of his influences, his magazines and his newspapers, on Mr. Wilson and Mr. Taft. This is the first time that I have ever seen in your ranks one man get up from one section, belonging to one faction of your party, and make charges which were absolutely true, and another member of the party, belonging to another faction, get up and charge the same sort of thing-fraud and corruption, and things of that sort, in your conventions-when both of you told the truth.

You are both telling the truth this time. So what hope can you hold out when you go home this fall, all you old Members who have been here for years and who have an extra number of these cedar boxes and books and things of that sort here. Do not take them all home at one trip. Take some with you when the present session of Congress adjourns and leave them at home, because you will be overloaded next March. ple are done with you. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Maybe one or two of you progressives may get back, but as I said here last summer a real, sure-enough, standpat Republican on that side of the House next year will look as big as a martin on a fodder pole. I imagine that my good friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Humphrey], will have a long and lonesome trip home next spring. imagine that probably some of the other distinguished gentlemen, who have adhered so conscientiously to the standpat principles, will have a powerful lonesome trip. You have my sympathy, gentlemen. We gave you an opportunity to do better. We brought you up where you could have taken the political sacrament with the Democratic Party, and you turned aside. You would not sup with us. Now, I am done with you. [Laughter.]

You fellows are divided into two camps, and each camp accuses the other of high crimes and misdemeanors, and I am satisfied that both factions are guilty of every charge made

during the general debate.

Here are Republican witnesses testifying to the bribery and corrupt methods indulged in by the Roosevelt faction and the Taft faction in the primary and at Chicago, and the American people believe that you are both guilty.

O, ye of many political sins and little faith, you remind me of the old negro preacher's camp-meeting hymn. It ran like this-

Your thoughts on awful subjects dwell, Damnation and the dead. O what hell-a-shus horrors hang Around your gullty head.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has six minutes remaining, and that six minutes he yields to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KINKEAD].

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to my friend from Connecticut [Mr. Tilson] that since there are but 26 minutes remaining, we make some agreement as to the time? I understand the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Tilson] is the only other Member who wishes to speak

Mr. TILSON. If the House will give consent, I am willing that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KINKEAD] may have

half the time and I the other half.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he had agreed to recognize the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Tilson] for the last 20 minutes of this debate. The gentleman from Connecticut can divide the time between himself and the gentleman from New Jersey.
Mr. TILSON. There is no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Kinkead] is recognized for 14 minutes. Mr. MANN. Can the gentleman from New Jersey conclude in that time?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I scarcely think so.
Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that
the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Tilson] may have 15 minutes after we commence the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule, so that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KINKEAD] may have the additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Tilson] may occupy 15 minutes when the bill is taken up

under the five-minute rule. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair understands that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KINKEAD] is to be recognized for how long'

Mr. TILSON. For the remainder of the time under general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 24 minutes.

[Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey addressed the committee. See

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from New Jersey can not be entertained by the Chair for the reason the time was fixed in the House for debate.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAFFERTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. Harrison of New York having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the President of the United States having returned to the Senate, in which it originated, the bill (S. 4862) for the relief of certain persons having supplied labor and materials for the prosecution of the work of constructing the Corbett Tunnel of the Shoshone irrigation project, with his objections thereto, the Senate proceeded, in pursuance of the Constitution, to reconsider the same, and

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senate agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 24450) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes.

LIMITATION OF HOURS OF EMPLOYEES ON PUBLIC WORKS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 1, 2, and 3 of an act entitled "An act relating to the limitation of the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon the public works of the United States and of the District of Columbia" be amended to read as follows:
"SECTION 1. That the service and employment of all laborers and mechanics who are now, or may hereafter be, employed by the Government of the United States or the District of Columbia, or by any contractor or subcontractor, upon a public work of the United States or of the District of Columbia, and of all persons who are now, or may hereafter be, employed by the Government of the United States or the District of Columbia, or any contractor or subcontractor, in constructing, maintaining, or improving a river or harbor of the United States and of the District of Columbia, is hereby limited and restricted to eight hours in any one calendar day; and it shall be unlawful for any officer of the United States Government or of the District of

Columbia, or any such contractor or subcontractor whose duty it shall be to employ, direct, or control the services of such laborers or mechanics or persons employed in constructing, maintaining, or improving a river or harbor of the United States or of the District of Columbia, to require or permit any such laborer or mechanic or persons employed in improving, maintaining, and constructing a river or harbor of the United States or of the District of Columbia, to work more than eight hours in any calendar day, except in case of extraordinary emergency.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a committee amendment. Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Tilson] was given leave to address the

The CHAIRMAN. There was unanimous consent given to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Tilson] for 15 minutes,

and under that order the gentleman is recognized.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I feel like apologizing to the House for obstructing the real business of the day-political speechmaking-by submitting at this point a few observations that are neither partisan nor political, as that word is commonly used, but relate to the comparatively unimportant subject of the national defense. What I have to say is on the subject of a national military reserve.

It has been the fashion of late-in fact, it always is in time of peace—to speak disparagingly of preparations for war. Even those who advocate, as a matter of common business prudence, a reasonable state of preparedness for war are often

regarded as bloodthirsty ogres desiring war.

No one can detest more than I do war and its horrors. The time and place of my birth and early training combined to make me hate war with all the intensity of my being. No vocabulary, not even Gen. Sherman's, is adequate to describe it. He who could have it in his heart to desire war is worse than a traitor to his country; he is an enemy to his race. All the peace societies, congresses, and associations, having for their purpose the prevention of war, have my most cordial sympathy and best wishes. We all agree that wars are wrong, and it is so delightful to dream of a future in which war shall be no more. There is every reason why such a dream should come to pass and no good reason why it should not, and yet there is the fear lurking here, there, and everywhere of the rude awakening.

The experience of the past rests heavily in the other scale. The history of our own and other countries teaches another story. Since the establishment of our Republic not a generation has passed without seeing us at war, and within half the period of a generation every large country and a large majority of the small ones have been at war. It would be pleasant to regard all these instances as exceptions and to hold to the belief that henceforth all nations "shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks." It is really quite a shock to see that the workers in iron and steel of other

countries are really otherwise engaged.

I am not one of those who believe that trade necessarily means war. It is and should be one of the strongest bonds of peace, and yet we can not ignore the fact that it has often meant war nor blind ourselves to the probability that it will cause war in the future.

To-day we stand among the foremost commercial aggressors of the world and one of the weakest of military powers. In the product of the smelter which converts our inexhaustible resources in minerals into commercial products, in the coal measures of Pennsylvania which supply the needs of the world in fuel, in the cotton belt which furnishes 70 per cent of the world's supply, in the grain belts of the great Mississippi Basin, in the cattle ranges of the West, we are producing the products of the world, by the sale of which we are more and more coming into competition with others, and our continued success in the struggle depends upon our ability to sell in the open markets of the world.

It is not a simple coincidence that the nation that has the greatest foreign trade has also the greatest navy. The navy did not make the trade; the trade resulted from natural conditions; and when trade became great enough it demanded a navy for its protection. It was good business policy to create the navy; no other consideration dictated the result.

It is not necessary to ask what nation has the greatest army. It is necessary only to locate the nation whose natural wealth is among the greatest and whose boundaries are the most vulnerable and accessible to adjacent competitors. It is good business policy to maintain an army for such a nation; no other

consideration can prevail. So it was good business policy to acquire Hawaii, Guam, and Alaska, because of their influence upon trade; good business policy to acquire the Philippines, because these islands lie upon the main trade route to the Orient and because possession of the Philippines means favorable trade relations with 400,000,000

people in China, who have not as yet developed the power to manufacture; good policy to free Cuba and to secure control of

Porto Rico; and good policy to maintain the Monroe doctrine as to our neighbors to the south of us. That war may grow out of such a situation no person can doubt who is not infatuated with the theory that altruism governs the price of stocks on the ex-

changes of New York, Paris, and Berlin.

We have steel and iron products, cotton, cereals, minerals, and manufactured products to sell, and coffee, silk, rubber, and so forth, to buy. We must, as business men, maintain our markets and secure uninterrupted arrival of raw materials for our manufacturing plants. To accomplish this, when competition becomes sufficiently keen, it is essential that there be adequate military preparedness to secure respect for the just claims of our people. As the business interests of a city demand its police, so the business interests of the Nation demand an Army and a Navy commensurate with the firmness of its foreign policy and the magnitude of its foreign trade.

Fortunately the geographical position of the United States is such that hitherto there has been occasion for only a small standing Army. There should not be need for a large standing Army if proper use is made of our military resources. We have the men and we have the means. It is our duty to have them ready for use when needed. The problem which confronts us is one of being able to use readily, with the least waste pos-

sible, the resources at our command.

As business men we should solve that problem with the least expenditure from the Federal Treasury. A brief review of the history of the past suffices to indicate the weakness and the suicidal extravagance of the legislative policy or lack of policy heretofore pursued in connection with this subject.

In every war since Revolutionary times to 1898 we have trifled with short enlistments, bounties, and other dangerous policies until our national integrity has been all but sacrificed. Much of our history on this point is rather painful, so it is not

my purpose to go into the details of the subject.

Suffice it to say that during the Revolutionary War we called to the colors 231,771 Continentals and 164,087 militia, a total of 395,858 soldiers, to oppose approximately 150,605 British soldiers. During the War of 1812 we called to the ranks 56,032 Regulars and 471,622 Volunteers, rangers, and militia, a total of 527,654 soldiers, while the greatest number of soldiers operating in the field against this army of Americans amounted to 55,000 British and Canadians; yet the history of that conflict is largely one of disgraceful defeats for our armies during a war which might have terminated in great national disaster had not the situation on the Continent of Europe restrained England from following up her advantages gained here.

Again, despite the experiences of 1776-1781 and 1812, the Mex-Ican War saw us enlisting men for 3 months, 6 months, 12 months, and finally adopting the only safe policy of enlisting for the war. As a result of these mistakes we beheld the disgraceful spectacle of American soldiers demanding their discharges in the face of the enemy and returning to their homes in the United States, thus halting Scott's victorious columns for more than two months at Puebla, within three days' march of the enemy's capital, his army reduced to 5,820 effective men. Despite the fact that we called into the service for this war B1,024 Regulars and 73,532 Volunteers-total, 104,556 enlisted men-to overthrow approximately 46,000 Mexicans, yet so hampered was the commanding general in the field by the policy enunciated in the laws enacted by Congress that Gen. Scott was compelled to advance with a half-trained army of about 14,000 men, 3,000 of whom were sick or in hospital, upon the City of Mexico, defended by about 36,000 Mexicans provided with 100

Never during the whole campaign could Gen. Scott muster upon the field of battle a force superior to that of the enemy, though the total enlisted force in the service of the United States at all times greatly exceeded the strength of the Mexican

Army

It would have seemed reasonable to believe that the experiences of this campaign would have served to correct the wasteful and dangerous policy of the past, but success blinded our statesmen to the very valuable lesson of that campaign, and the opening of the Civil War finds the President calling for 75,000 militia for three months. As a result of the lack of proper legislation we called into the service during the war a total of 67,000 regulars and 2,605,341 militia and volunteers.

During the continuance of the war all the errors of the past were repeated and even aggravated. The bounty system was utilized in its most vicious form, and the extent to which bounty jumping was practiced should suffice to warn all succeeding Congresses against legislation which may permit a repetition of scenes so shameful.

More conspicuous, however, than any other error during this long struggle was that of failing to provide any means of main-

taining the ranks at their maximum strength in rifles. Instead, the strength of organizations was permitted to decrease until the power of combat had practically ceased to exist, and new organizations were created, supplied with all the costly machinery of administration, and were sent to the front to replace the fragments of veteran organizations whose commanders had become skilled in leadership, but who found themselves without troops to command. The value of their experience was disregarded, a premium was placed on ignorance, the Treasury was unnecessarily drawn upon, and the integrity of the Union was jeopardized. In successive appeals the Government called for 75,000 militia for three months, 100,000 volunteers for one year, and 42,834 volunteers for the war. To all of these calls the people responded with abundant enthusiasm.

On the 4th of July, 1861, the Government found at its disposal the following heterogeneous mixture of troops:

Regulars and volunteers enlisted for 3 months and for the war 225, 000 Volunteers for the war 50, 000 New regiments of the Regular Army 25, 000 Total 300, 000

Yet already the enlistments of the three-month men were expiring, and the Government at the outset of the campaign was compelled to deduct from its fighting forces 80,000, or 26 per cent of the enlisted men mustered in.

The disaster of Bull Run resulted in a call for 500,000 volunteers to serve for not less than six months nor more than three years. So enthusiastic was the response that in 1862 the Government believed that it had secured the service of all men necessary for the prosecution of the war and committed the fatal mistake of ceasing to recruit. The Army now amounted to 600,000 men, and the opinion prevailed that 200,000 men could march from Washington to New Orleans without opposition. All that was wanted was for some one to command "Forward, Had the directors of the Federal policy but turned to the record of our past experience they would have seen that means must be provided for supplying the fearful wastage in an aggressive campaign, and that if 600,000 men were needed to meet the enemy, every effort of the Government should have been directed toward maintaining that number on the battle front of the Nation's armies. But what happened? For answer let us turn to the Records of the Rebellion and open any volume covering the period of 1863. The campaign of Vicksburg will suffice for the purpose. On pages 579 and 580, volume 24, part 2, Records of the Rebellion, the report of Brig. Gen. Osterhaus, United States Army, commanding the Ninth Division, shows the following:

First Brigade: Forty-ninth Indiana Regiment Sixty-ninth Indiana Regiment Seventh Kentucky Regiment One hundred and twentieth Ohio Regiment	199	
n		1, 108
Second Brigade: Fifty-fourth Indiana Regiment Twenty-second Ohio Regiment Sixteenth Ohio Regiment Forty-second Ohio Regiment	359	
		1,304
		2, 412

The minimum strength of two Infantry brigades should have been 7,840 enlisted men, and it should have been the policy of the Government to maintain them constantly at that strength by a process of recruiting conducted at the home depots; but no home depots existed.

Again, we find the following return of the Department of Tennessee, Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant commanding, on May 31, 1863, near Vicksburg, Miss.:

Present for duty, enlisted Aggragate Aggregate pres present. and absent. men. THIRTEENTH ARMY CORPS, 6, 764 6, 988 6, 239 5, 455 3,076 3,134 3,430 2,787 Fourteenth Division..... 12, 427 16,650 25, 446 Total.... FIFTEENTH ARMY CORPS. First Division..... 9,419 7,412 4,587 5,723 5,135 13,817 17,487 Total....

	Present for duty, enlisted men.	Aggregate present.	Aggregate present and absent.
SIXTEENTH ARMY CORPS,	PL DAY	7.45	
First Division. Third Division Fourth Division.	7,282 5,507 5,943	8,796 7,140 6,966	11,862 9,040 9,859
Total	18,732	22,902	30,761
SEVENTEENTH ARMY CORPS.	THE ST	ST STORY	
Third Division Sixth Division Seventh Division	5, 294 4, 225 3, 967	6,611 5,141 5,084	9,981 6,979 7,971
Total	13,486	17,836	24,931

Exact information as to arrival of recruits is not available, and exact comparisons are therefore not possible, but some idea of the operation of the system can be secured by comparison of the preceding table with the following taken from the Records of the Rebellion, volume 24, part 3, pages 567 to 568, as shown in the return of the Department of Tennessee, Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant commanding, for the month of July, 1863, one month after the rendition of the preceding report:

	Present for duty enlisted men.	Aggregate present.	Aggregate present and absent.
THIRTEENTH ARMY CORPS.			
Tenth Division	2,788 3,605	4,098 4,546	6,406 6,918
Total	6,393	8,644	12,324
FIFTEENTH ARMY CORPS.			
First Division. Second Division Third Division. Fourth Division.	4,363 4,337 3,419 5,796	6,419 5,655 5,074 7,642	9,555 8,914 7,004 8,896
Total	17,915	24,790	34, 369
SEVENTEENTH ARMY CORPS.			100
Third Division. Sixth Division. Seventh Division.	4,753 3,706 3,507	6,572 5,124 4,888	9,407 6,825 7,411
Total	11,966	16,584	23,643
Grand totals, 9 divisions	36, 274	50,018	70,336
Average	4,031	5,557	7,815

A little more than one year had elapsed since recruiting had ceased, yet the average strength of a division present for duty, as seen from the above returns, was 4,031 enlisted men, whereas the minimum strength of a division in enlisted men (Infantry alone) should have been 11,760, and it should have been the business of the Government to maintain the recruiting system so as to supply the wastage as rapidly as it occurred. It is fruitless to say that the political situation compelled the Presi-

Officers:

1 colonel \$5,000.00
1 lieutenant colonel 4,500.00
3 majors, \$4,000 each 12,000.00
15 captains, \$3,120 each 46,800.00
15 first lieutenants, \$2,400 each 28,050.00

Total 132,350.00

Noncommissioned officers:
1 sergeant major (third enlistment) 53.00
1 quartermaster sergeant (third enlistment) 53.00
1 commissary sergeant (third enlistment) 53.00
3 battalion sergeants major, \$48 each (third enlistment) 96.00

Total 390.00
4 Total 390.00
3 battalion sergeants (third enlistment) 44,000
1 commissary sergeant (third enlistment) 96.00

Total 60 \$10 colon \$10

dent to call for the organization of new regiments to maintain the necessary force in the field. That which compelled his action was the lack of a system to feed the firing line, and as statesmen, profiting by the experience of the past, it is our sacred duty to see that such a system is provided for the future. We should treat the matter of Army organization as a purely business proposition and remove while we may the causes which will otherwise render certain a repetition of the conditions to which I have referred.

We have lived through one war since the dark days of the Rebellion, yet the experience of 1898 shows that practically all remains yet to be done. War was declared with Spain on April 21, 1898. On April 26 Congress added two companies to each regiment of Infantry, increasing the number of companies in each regiment from 10 to 12, and authorized enlistments to increase the Regular Army to 62,597 men; but again no machinery was in existence to supply the extra men demanded by the situation, and the returns from the field of battle show that we assaulted San Juan on the 1st day of July, 1898, with an average of 556 enlisted men in the Infantry regiments participating in the attack, whereas the enlisted strength of each should have been 1,272.

The following table shows the strength of the regiments concerned:

Enlisted were present for duty equipped

Distillation with bicones for many charlibons	
Sixteenth United States Infantry	655
Sixth United States Infantry	461
Seventy-first New York Infantry	922
Second United States Infantry	618
Tenth United States Infantry	432
Twenty-first United States Infantry	441
Ninth United States Infantry	445
Thirteenth United States Infantry	441
Twenty-fourth United States Infantry	516
Eighth United States Infantry	487
Twenty-second United States Infantry	467
Second Massachusetts Infantry	863 438
First United States Infantry	
Fourth United States Infantry	500
Twenty-fifth United States InfantrySeventh United States Infantry	
Twelfth United States Infantry	
Seventeenth United States Infantry	482
Third United States Infantry	
Twentieth United States Infantry	573
I Wentieth Omited States Intantif	0.0
Total	11, 113
Average per regiment	556

(Campaign of Santiago de Cuba, vol. 3, pp. 214, 215, 216, 217.)

It will be seen from the foregoing outline of history of our wars that the organization of the Army has always resulted in maintaining in the field a minimum organization in rifles requiring a maximum burden of overhead charges. In order that the exact effect of this policy in dollars and cents may be seen I have had drawn up in parallel columns an exact statement of the costs involved in maintaining 400,000 Infantry in the field, organized at full war strength according to the act of February 2, 1901, and in maintaining the same number of riflemen in the field organized into regiments of the same average strength as those engaged in the campaign of Santiago in 1898.

The following comparison is made of the cost of 400,000 Infantry (which means 368,000 rifles) in the field—(a) if organized with ranks full under the act of February 2, 1901; (b) if organized in regiments of the actual strength of those which participated in the campaign of Santiago:

Officers:	
1 colonel	_ \$5, 000. 00
1 lieutenant colonel	4, 500. 00
3 majors; \$4,000 each	_ 12,000.00
15 captains, \$3,120 each	46, 800.00
15 first lieutenants, \$2,400 each	_ 36, 000. 00
15 second lieutenants, \$1,870 each	28, 050. 00
Total	132, 350. 00
Noncommissioned officers:	
1 sergeant major (third enlistment)	_ 53, 00
1 sergeant major (third enlistment) 1 quartermaster sergeant (third enlistment)	_ 53, 00
1 commissary sergeant (third enlistment)	_ 53.00
3 battalion sergeants major, \$48 each (third enlist	
ment	_ 144, 00
2 color sergeants, \$48 each (third enlistment)	_ 96,00
Total	399, 00
Total for year	4, 788, 00
Band:	
1 chief musician (third enlistment)	83, 00
1 principal musician (third enlistment)	
1 drum major (second enlistment)	40.00
4 sergeants (second enlistment), \$40 each	160,00
8 corporals (second enlistment), \$33 each	264, 00
1 cook (second enlistment)	. 33, 00
12 privates (second enlistment), \$24 each	288, 00
Total	916.00
Total for year	

(A) WAR-STRENGTH ORGANIZATION—continued.	most seen	(B) SANTIAGO ORGANIZATION—continued.	
Company: 1 first sergeant (third enlistment) 1 quartermaster sergeant (third enlistment) 6 sergeants (third enlistment), \$36 each 10 corporals (second enlistment), \$24 each 2 cooks (second enlistment), \$33 each 2 musicians (second enlistment), \$18 each 1 artificer (second enlistment)	96 00	Company: 1 first sergeant (third enlistment) 1 quartermaster sergeant (third enlistment) 4 sergeants (third enlistment), \$36 each 6 corporals (second enlistment), \$24 each 2 cooks (second enlistment), \$33 each 2 musiclans (second enlistment), \$18 each 1 artificer (second enlistment)	144. 00 144. 00 66. 00
Total	671.00	Total	503. 00
Total for year	8, 052. 00 24, 521. 16	Total for year26 privates, average pay, \$193.08	6, 036. 00 5, 020. 08
Pay for 1 year (total in company, 150 men) Pay of 12 companies for 1 year Pay of officers for 1 year Pay of enlisted men:	32, 573, 16 390, 877, 92 132, 350, 00	Pay for 1 year (total in company, 43 men) Pay of 12 companies for 1 year Pay of officers for 1 year Pay of enlisted men:	11, 056. 08 132, 672. 96 132, 350. 00
8 noncommissioned staff	4, 788. 00 10, 992. 00 390, 877. 92	Pay of enlisted men: 8 noncommissioned staff	4, 788. 00 10, 992. 00 132, 672. 96
Total pay	539, 007. 92	Total pay	280, 802. 96
Annual cost for subsistence, clothing, fuel, transportation; mounts, quartermaster's, sanitary and ordnance supplies per annum, for each enlisted man————————————————————————————————————		Annual cost for subsistence, clothing, fuel, transportation; mounts, quartermaster's, sanitary and ordnance supplies per annum, for each enlisted man Total for 556 men	210. 93 117, 277. 08
Forage for regimental horsesLoss in horsefleshHorseshoes	739, 55	Forage for regimental horses Loss in horseflesh Horseshoes	720 55
Total	6, 955. 15	Total	6, 955. 15
Officers: Fuel in field Sanitation	8. 00 9. 37	Officers: Fuel in field	9, 37
TotalCost for 50 officers	17. 37 838, 50	TotalCost for 50 officers	17. 37 868, 50
Total cost of maintaining 1,836 enlisted men in the field per annum: Pay Equipment, subsistence, etc. Forage, horseflesh, etc. Fuel and sanitary supplies, officers.	539, 007, 92 387, 267, 48	Total cost of maintaining 556 enlisted men in the field per annum: Pay. Equipment, subsistence, etc. Forage, horsefiesh, etc. Fuel and sanitary supplies, officers.	280, 802, 96 117, 277, 08 6, 955, 15 865, 50
Total	934, 099, 05	Total	405, 903, 69
Number of men who may be utilized as riflemen in each company. Number of companies in regiment. Number of rifles available on firing line. Cost per rifle (934,099.05÷1,656) yearly. Cost of rifle per year in Santiago organization.	128 12 1,656 \$564.07	Number of men who may be utilized as riflemen in each company. Number of companies in regiment. Number of rifles available on firing line. Cost per ride (405,903.69 + 396) yearly.	33 12 396
Cost of rifle per year, regiments full Difference in cost per rifle per year Difference in cost per rifle per day Difference in cost per day for 400,000 infantry Difference in cost per month (30 days) Difference in cost per year	(368,000 rifle	1, 564, 07 460, 94 1, 262 464, 416, 00 13, 932, 480, 00 169, 625, 920, 00 It will therefore require \$169,625,920 more per year	

The following table is presented to show how the cost per annum of maintaining a private soldier, which is used as a basis of calculation in the preceding table, is arrived at:

Subsistence, 365 days, at 24 cents per day		\$87.60
Allowance for 3 years, \$129.88. For 1 year— Issue on memorandum receipt of 2 blankets, \$2.65 each, \$5.30. Life of blanket, 6 years. Cost for	\$43. 29	
1 year	. 88	
Overcoat, \$12.38. Life of garment, 6 years. Cost for 1 year	2.06	
Sweater, \$2.66. Life of garment, 6 years. Cost for 1 year	. 44	
Poncho, \$2.72. Life of garment, 3 years. Cost for 1 year	. 91	
Total for 1 year		47. 81 8. 00
Fuel		22. 20 6. 20
Sanitary suppliesOrdnance, worn out in service		9. 37 19. 31
		910 09

The total in the table here presented does not include the cost of barracks nor the heating and lighting of same, as this calculation pertains to the cost incident to maintaining troops in the field only.

For the benefit of those who have not the time to fully examine the tables the following summary is made:

Cost	per rifle, per rifle,	Spanish-American ranks filled	War	\$1, 025. 01 564. 07
	mbo die	Comonas In sout name	wifia	460 94

It will therefore require \$169,625,920 more per year to maintain 400,000 Infantry in the field (368,000 rifles) with regiments depleted as in the Spanish-American War than to maintain the same number of Infantry in the field with the same number of rifles if the ranks be filled to war strength, as authorized by, law. Such expenditures as these will drive us to bankruptcy if we are again confronted with a war of long duration. Some system must be developed to avoid this suicidal extravagance.

It is scarcely necessary to say to business men that it is far better to create in time of peace all the machinery necessary to accomplish the desired results in time of war. The problem is not a simple or easy one, but is one well worth the conscientious study of serious-minded men. For more than a year I have been giving the subject special attention and have come to the conclusion that the most important element in the proper solution of the problem is the creation of a proper military reserve. Therefore, on May 15, 1912, I introduced a bill, H. R. 24601, to provide for a national military reserve.

In my humble judgment that bill enacted into law will produce results far-reaching in their character and beneficent in their operation touching the national defense of this country. The basic fact upon which the proposed bill rests is that with our Army and militia as at present constituted we each year discharge into civil life a large number of trained Regulars and twice as many more trained militiamen, a large percentage of whom may be utilized for filling the ranks to war strength within a few days after the outbreak of war, if a rational system be developed in time of peace for accomplishing this result.

Under the provisions of the bill only such number of these men as may be necessary to fill the ranks of the Army and of the militia to war strength belong to the active or class A reserves, the remainder to the inactive or class B reserves

In response to a Senate resolution the Secretary of War under date of January 15, 1912, transmitted to the Senate certain information relative to Army enlistments for the 10 years ending June 30, 1911, which is published as Senate Document No. 259, Sixty-second Congress, second session. In this document it appears that for the 10 years the average number of men discharged by reason of expiration of term of enlistment is 18,103, of which an average of 10,219 reenlist. This leaves approximately 8,000 to be discharged annually into class A

In figuring the number of reserves necessary to raise the authorized peace strength of our Army to the war strength, the Philippines, Hawaii, Panama, and Alaska may be left out. The garrison in the Philippine Islands is to be maintained at

war strength. It is highly improbable that soldiers discharged from regiments in Hawaii, Panama, or Alaska will remain in the vicinity for a sufficient period of time to form an active reserve sufficiently numerous to raise these regiments to war strength. The necessary men for this purpose must be secured by drafts upon class B reserves and by shipments from general recruiting depots in the United States. The question, then, as to the organization of a reserve will be considered here as relating to the garrisons in the United States only. The following table indicates for these organizations the reserves needed to bring them up to war strength:

Organization.	Author- ized strength.	War strength.	Number of reservists needed to expand to war strength.
16 regiments of Infantry. 12 regiments of Cavalry. 4 regiments of Field Artillery. Coast Artillery Corps. Engineers.	870 855 877 18, 471 2, 002	1,836 1,236 1,186 19,147 1,942	15, 456 4, 572 836 676 60
Total number of class A reserves needed			21,600

As approximately 8,000 men will be discharged annually into class A reserves, in a period of three years there will be available more than the necessary number of reservists to fill the ranks of the Army to war strength. Under section 6 of the bill this is done automatically by adopting a contract of enlistment requiring three years with the colors and three years with the active reserves. Upon the completion of six years' service three with the colors and three with the reserves-all further obligation under the oath of enlistment ceases.

In order that it may be known exactly what force may be relied upon in case of war, and in order that a high degree of proficiency in field training may be assured, it is desirable that the active or class A reserves be required to join the organizations to which they belong once each year for 10 days' field training. The feasibility of doing so is dependent principally upon the cost, which may be estimated as follows:

The reservists will be scattered over the entire country. distribution, for the purposes of rough calculations, may be assumed to be uniform. The zone in which reservists from any garrison will be located may be determined by drawing a line through points midway between the posts and the next garrison. As shown in the table of distances between posts, which I insert in the RECORD without reading, it is found that, assuming a uniform distribution of reservists, each active or class A reservist would travel an average distance of 871 miles in joining his organization, or 175 miles in joining his organiza-tion and then returning to his home. The cost of assembling 21,600 active reservists for 10 days' training would then be as follows:

Pay-21,600 men, at 55 cents a day for 10 days	\$51,840 118,800
Transportation—21,600 men, 175 miles, at 2.262 cents per mile	86, 400

If, in addition to the above, the active reservists be allowed \$2 per month, or \$24 per year, the annual pay for this purpose will amount to \$518,400, and the total cost of assembling the reservists for 10 days' training and of paying them at the above

rates will amount to \$775,440 annually.

Mr. ROBINSON. Might I ask the gentleman what will be the expense if the reserve is not called into the service?

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman means if it is not called into

Mr. ROBINSON. No; I mean the current expenses contemplated by the gentleman's bill.

Mr. TILSON. The current expenses contemplated by the bill when not called into service would be \$775,000 per year, which is sufficient to maintain every organization in the present Army at a real war strength. The gentleman will understand that our peace strength is much less than what our war strength is. This bill would carry the peace strength of each organization in the ranks and the war strength on the rolls, the men making up the difference being in a state of furlough, instead of being

present with their organization.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then in time of peace we really add

\$775,000 annually to the expense?

Mr. TILSON. Yes; in case reservists attend maneuvers 10 days, but in case they do not this would be decreased about one-third. In other words, it costs a little over \$500,000 to maintain the reserve without maneuvers, but I consider the 10 days' training each year to be very important.

The transportation and subsistence furnished a soldier on discharge includes his actual railroad transportation, tourist sleeper accommodations, and rations commuted at the rate of 50 cents per meal and three meals to a day.

The following is a table showing the actual cost of transportation and subsistence between certain central points:

Railroad Cost Tourist fare cost to Gov-ernment Miles. mutaper mile. sleeper. rations San Francisco to—
New York
Leavenworth, Kans
New Orleans, La
Atlanta, Ga
Boston, Mass
Chicago to—
New Orleans, La
New York
Washington, D. C. \$59.77 29.00 42.89 50.33 3, 191 1, 955 2, 482 2, 810 \$7.20 4.40 4.60 \$7.50 6.00 6.50 \$0.0233 .0201 .0217 5.80 .0226 7.50 60.76 3,313 15.75 18.52 16.64 912 .0213 912 2.00 1.75 .0241

The average cost per mile per man to the Government for those men who are actually furnished railroad ticket and sleeping car, based on upper tourist berth, and rations commuted at \$1.50 per day, is \$0.02262. Table showing distances between adjacent posts and the average distance which must be traveled to arrive at any given station.

Station.	Station. Adjacent station.		Average distance.	Half average dis- tance.
al La caméra Anti	(Monterey	125	1	
San Francisco	Salt Lake City Vancouver	780	576	288
Monterey	San Francisco San Diego Seattle		317	158
Vancouver	San Francisco. G. H. Wright. Boise.	780 372	461	230
Seattle	Vancouver	175 339	257	128
G. H. Wright	Seattle Vancouver Missoula	368	322	161
Missoula	Harrison G. H. Wright	125 258	191	95
Harrison	Yellowstone	511	} 564	282
Yellowstone	Mackenzie Harrison San Francisco	618	469	235
Douglas	HarrisonRussell.	511	621	310
Whipple Barracks	Huachuca	243 295	319	159
Huachuca		150	150	75
Bliss	D. A. Russell	948 501	} 724	362
Clark	Bliss	-501 298 143	312	156
Sam Houston	Clark. MeIntosh.	143 155 436	367	183
D. A. Russell	Douglas	525 248 526	479	240
Robinson	Riley. Mackenzie. Meade. Russell	410 282 164 248	295	147
Sill	Crook	436 200	360	180
Riley	Riley Sill Leavenworth Crook	364 364 131 323	273	136

Table showing distances between adjacent posts, etc .- Continued.

Station.	Adjacent station.	Distance.	Average distance,	- Half average dis- tance.
Leavenworth	Riley. L. H. Roots. Crook. Des Moines.	134 556 159 197	261	130
Crook	Leavenworth. Des Moines. Russell. Robinson.	159 156 526 486	332	166
Snelling	Limit northward	200 391 340	310	155
Sheridan	Snelling Wayne. Benjamin Harrison	391 302 220	304	152
Benjamin Harrison	Sheridan Wayne Oglethorpe Brady	220 291 461	324	162
Wayne	Benjamin Harrison. Sheridan. Benjamin Harrison.	399 291 302 461	330	165
Oglethorpe	L. H. Roots	454 153	356	178
McPherson	Oglethorpe	153 294	223	112
Porter	Niagara Ontario	36 175	106	53
Madison Barracks	OntarioPlattsburg Barracks	72 204	} 138	69
Plattsburg Barracks	Ethan Allen	71 313	} 192	96

Total of half distances 5,175
Total number of stations 30
Average half distance between stations 175

From data gathered by inquiry of a large number of soldiers it appears that the emoluments in the bill are sufficient to secure the active reserve desired. The maintenance of an active reserve sufficient to fill the ranks of the Army to war strength at the outbreak of war would therefore cost \$775,000 per year, and only \$518,400 if the reserves are not annually assembled for a 10-day encampment.

The difficulty of keeping track of reservists has been suggested as an obstacle in the way of the establishment of such a reserve. To administer the affairs of those men by direct correspondence with the War Department would probably prove impracticable. The highest officer charged with the administration of such affairs should be the division commander, who should have authority to transfer reservists from one division or one regiment to another in his division, as they change their residence, and to transfer the records of reservists accordingly. Only such correspondence as must come to the War Department in the case of enlisted men at the present time should come to the War Department in the case of reservists.

For practical purposes the localization of regiments will be accomplished as soon as the garrisons for the Philippine Islands, Hawali, and Panama have reached their prescribed stations. Reservists for each regiment in the United States may then be drawn from a well-defined area which will never change. Under such circumstances the local commanding officer is the official most interested in the maintenance of a local reserve, and it is he who should correspond directly with the local reservists, the latter forming an actual part of his command to be carried on his company reports and returns just as members of his actual command at the present time are carried.

In each company the necessary equipment should be on hand for each reservist pertaining to that company, who should receive his equipment when he reports for his annual field work, just as is now done in a militia company when men report for drill.

Under this plan reservists become furloughed members of companies, with reduced pay, and are required to serve annually only 10 days with their organizations. No extensive change in the existing system of administration is either necessary or desirable.

What has been said of reservists for the Regular Army applies, with some modifications, to the militia. Neither The Adjutant General of the Army nor the adjutant general of a State should be required to keep track of such reservists, except by means of the usual company and other reports now required. Finally, if the enlistment period for both the Regular Army and the Organized Militia be made six years, three of which are to be served with the colors and three to be served on furlough with the active or Class A reserves, then the obligation of the reservist to return to the colors when so ordered by proper authority will be the same as that imposed by the Articles of War upon any soldier furloughed from his regular command.

A sufficient number of class A reserves may be maintained to fill the ranks to war strength, but more men will be necessary to repair the losses in campaign and to form the nucleus of volunteeer regiments. Such men are provided for in the inactive or class B reserves. They should utilize for the purposes of organization, training, and equipment the plant and all the established machinery of Government employed by the Regular Thus, barracks, reservations, and camp sites vacated by the Regular Army when the first line moves to the front would become points of mobilization for class B reserves and for volunteer organizations. Such reservists should be made up of enlisted men discharged from class A reserves and of enlisted men of at least three years' service in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps who have been honorably discharged, except for physical disability, all of whom should be required to take a proper oath of enlistment requiring them to join the colors upon proclamation by the President announcing that their services are needed. These men, being in excess of the statutory strength of the Army, should not be carried upon the rolls, but in order that exact information may always be available as to their strength, separate lists of class B reserves should be made out by organization commanders in whose districts they reside, and such lists, showing names, addresses, etc., of the reservists, should be forwarded periodically to the War Department.

The provisions of the bill relating to the enlistment of class B reserves are sufficiently broad to permit the Secretary of War to take the necessary steps to provide for the organization of such reservists into tactical units in time of peace and to permit the assignment of commanders and reserve officers thereto; and it is provided that the President may, by proclamation, direct the mobilization of class B reserves at points prepared in time of peace for their reception. B reserves provided for in the bill should be drawn from the local regiments of the Regular Army, from graduates of military institutions at which Army officers are retained as professors of military science and tactics, and from other sources. Officers of the Regular Army are to be assigned to the reserve, whereas officers drawn from other sources are to be actually commissioned therein in the grades of captain and first and second lieutenant.

Membership in class B reserves carries with it no right of retirement or retirement pay, or pay or allowances of any kind, but upon proclamation by the President directing the mobilization of reserves, officers commissioned in such reserves pass at once into active service as volunteers with the organizations to which they belong.

There will be no difficulty in officering class B reserves without additional expense to the National Treasury, but in order to keep the ranks filled some advantage should accrue to the soldier who places his name upon the rolls.

Nothing can justify a return to the bounty system practiced in the wars to which reference has already been made. greater mistake could be made than that of offering or paying a lump sum to any former soldier who presents himself upon the outbreak of war. Such a system invites a return to all the disgraceful scenes, the shaneful dishonesty, and the hopeless confusion which characterized the bounty period of the Civil War. The adoption of such a plan would ultimately compel the Government to offer a similar bounty to all who enlisted for the war and would, in the event of a great war, add billions to the cost of our campaigns. In my judgment we may escape all of this and still secure the men we desire by following the sound and well-established policy which now prevails in the Regular Army of paying an increased wage to the men of superior experience. Thus the private of Infantry receives \$15 per month in his first enlistment, \$18 in his second enlistment, \$21 in his third enlistment, and an increase of \$1 per month thereafter for each enlistment until in his seventh enlistment, when he receives \$25 per month. This principle is incorporated in the sections of the bill providing for the organization of class B reserves. A reasonable inducement is thus offered to enlist in such reserve and to remain therein in time of peace, for such reservist, if called in the event of war, will receive a better wage than his brother in arms who declines to become a reservist.

In section 5 provision is made for officers to command the skeleton organization of the class B reserves. Commissions are to be given only to captains and first and second lieutenants. The principal source of supply will be the militia and the military schools at which officers of the Army are detailed as instructors. Graduates of such schools have received the basic education for a military profession, but many of the benefits resulting therefrom are lost because we have no means of utilizing them. The section of the bill touching this subject is drawn along the lines adopted for the formation of the Medical Reserve Corps of the Army, which has already produced most

satisfactory results. The assignment of not more than four officers of the Regular Army to each regiment of class B reserves will permit the use of the whole machinery of the regular establishment for preserving the records, providing the equipment, and perfecting the organization in time of peace of a trained force which could be called into the service.

The force thus created preserves all the features of a volunteer organization, utilizing the regular service only to the extent which experience has shown to be necessary in order to secure With such an organization all of the arms, equipment, and so forth, for a volunteer organization may be accumulated in time of peace at the point of mobilization, and, under the provisions of section 11 of the bill, the necessary depots may be established at such points in order that recruitment may never cease and that a steady flow of enlisted men may be maintained to keep the organizations at the front always filled to their maximum strength with fighting men, thus avoiding a repetition of the experience of 1863 and 1898.

The labor involved and the time consumed in keeping track of class B reserves would probably be too great to require of officers of the National Guard, though they may be properly expected to keep track of class A reserves for their own organizations. Therefore no class B reserve for the militia is provided for in the bill.

Finally, in order that the Government may never lose the service of a man by the expiration of enlistment almost immediately after the outbreak of war, it is provided that all enlist-ments in the Army, the Organized Militia, and in class A and class B reserves shall, regardless of the time of their beginning, continue in force for one year unless the war sooner terminates. A provision is also added to the effect that nothing in the act should be construed to shorten the prescribed period of enlistment.

With this bill enacted into law and its provisions thoroughly worked out we could confidently rely upon each organization of our Army and Militia being ready at all times should an emergency suddenly arise to take the field at once with ranks filled to war strength with well-trained men. If the emergency should prove to be a serious one, we might expect to see within a few weeks an additional organization made up from class B reserve mobilized at the same place from which the original organization had moved out and ready to follow it to the front.

And bear in mind that only men already trained for their duties are thus far included. The importance of this feature of the plan can be fully appreciated only by those who have kept pace with the rapid development of firearms and the complete revolution in military tactics made necessary by the use of long-range, high-power, rapid-fire rifles and the still more wonderful improvement in artillery. Fifty years ago soldiers made the attack shoulder to shoulder. It would be suicide now. Then the trained men could carry with them by physical contact the untrained. Now, unless each individual soldier knows his duty, there is danger of his lack of training seriously impeding the

The plan which I have attempted to outline is in line with the true conservation spirit of our times. With comparatively small expense to the Federal Treasury it undertakes to gather up and keep ready for use when needed that greatest of military resources, heretofore almost disregarded, the men trained at great expense to fight our battles.

I close as I began by saying that I detest war. I do not believe it is imminent and earnestly pray that our people may be delivered from it throughout the years to come. Yet my duty as a Member of this House and of the great Committee on Mili-tary Affairs has brought me to consider these questions as a practical man and legislator, and not as an idealist or a dreamer. If I, with my responsibility resting upon me, should close my eyes to facts as they exist and be content to fold my arms in supplication that war may never come again, and then it should come and find my country unprepared, I should surely feel myself subject to the reproach of being an unfaithful as well as unprofitable servant. It is in that spirit I bring these observations upon a bill which I believe will accomplish much toward the solution of one of our serious problems, that of a proper, reasonable, and adequate national defense. [Applause.] The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TILSON. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 12, by inserting after the word "day" the following: "Which eight hours shall terminate within nine hours from the beginning of workday."

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman desire to have that amendment adopted in the form in which it is?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Yes; I think it is absolutely necessary because of the statement received from the War Department, and indeed testimony given before the committee, that they work in some cases 12 to 16 hours, and this amendment is necessary in order to correct that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the

amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if he will not accept an amendment to his amendment, reading as follows:

At the end of line 12, page 2, insert:

"Within nine hours from the beginning of workday, except in the case of service which is by its nature noncontinuous, or which requires only a portion of the employee's time, or which is required only for brief periods at intervals; and it shall be unlawful for any officer of the United States, or—

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would not agree to an amendment of that kind. That amendment would destroy the entire purpose of the bill. As I stated in reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], there are many of these workmen whose work is not continuous, although they are on duty continuously, and it has been stated to the committee in the hearings, and it is also stated from the War Department, that there are many of these men who do not now work more than eight hours, and yet they are continuously on duty from 12 hours and upward. So that with the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] the entire purpose of the bill would be destroyed. I have no objection whatever to an amendment which would exclude from the operations of this bill men who are engaged in tending locks, because there are many of those who are not burdened with arduous duties, who only have to tend to the locks two, three, or four times a day, and the remainder of the time they do not have to be on duty because they can be notified in plenty of time in advance of a vessel approaching the locks and attend to their duties there. I have no objection to an exception being made to that class of men, if that is the purpose of the gentleman, but I have an objection to the amendment in the form in which it is presented.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the committee, while I do not intend myself to press this amendment unless the gentleman will accept it, the suggestion was made to me by the Chief of Engineers. I called attention to this matter last Wednesday, when this bill was under discussion, referring at the time to a communication I had from the Chief of Engineers on the subject, and I am going to ask permission to extend my remarks in the Record and insert this document, as also a statement which I have since received from the same source, embracing several amendments to the bill, which that official thinks and which I believe should be adopted. One of these I have just read. I would like to insert both of these statements in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARK-MAN asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting certain papers to which he has referred. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The papers referred to are as follows:

[Memorandum on H. R. 18787, Sixty-second Congress, second session.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, July 22, 1912.

Office of the Chief of Engineers desires to invite attention to certain features of H. R. 18787, amending the act of August 1, 1892 (27 Stat., 340), which was favorably reported to the Committee of the Whole House on June 18, 1912, from the Committee on Labor, with a committee amendment in lines 12 and 13 of page 2 of the bill, as follows: "which eight hours shall terminate within nine hours from beginning of workday."

2. The hearings on this bill by the Committee on Labor February 20 to March 9, 1912, show that the intent of the bill, as stated by the Hon. W. B. Wilson, by whom it was introduced in the House, is to regulate "the hours of labor of men working on the steam shovels, the dredges, and the tugs on the Great Lakes and other seaport towns in possession of the United States," such employees having been declared by the Supreme Court of the United States in Eastern Dredging Co. v. the United States and Bay State Dredging Co. v. United States (206 U. S., 246) to be beyond the purities of the act of August 1, 1892. The wording of the bill itself, however, is much broader than its declared purpose indicates, and covers "all persons who are now or the District of Columbia or any contractor or subcontractor in constructing, maintaining, or improving a river or harbor of the United States and of the District of Columbia." It will be seen that this language covers not only the dredge workers for whose benefit the bill was introduced, but, while applying only to laborers and mechanics in other branches of the service, it applies to all employees engaged on river and harbor work, of whatever class and designation, no matter what may be the conditions of their employment. It will restrict the service of all masters, mates, and crews of all vessels—cooks, cooks' helpers, teamsters, and stablemen, and hostlers, the operating forces

at locas, and many other employees whose occupation requires them to be subject to call at irregular hours or at times outline some of the regular hours of at times outline some of the regular hours of a times outline some of the regular hours of a second state of the regular work in factory, shop, or mine, or on buildings or other works on shore. The factory, shop, or mine, or on buildings or other works on shore. The factory, shop, or mine, or on buildings or other works on shore. The factory, shop, or mine, or on buildings or other works on shore. The factory, shop, or mine, or on buildings or other works on shore. The factory shop, or mine, or on buildings or other works on shore. The factory shop of the hood hour, without interruption for eight hours, and is then free to go to his home until the hour for returning to work next day. The factory shop of the hours of the factory shop of the

will therefore either cut down the time of actual work of the dredge and of the individual members of the crew to less than 8 hours or will require the employment of an additional shift of men. It should be remembered that these employees are paid by the month and are not subject to loss of pay for lost time, even though the dredge be tied up doing nothing, and that, except in a few cases, they live on the dredge during the time she is in commission. The time occupied in placing the dredge in position for work and moving her out of the cut at night is analogous to the time occupied by the laborer or mechanic ashore in going to and from his place of employment. This time is not counted as part of his day's work, the beginning of which must find him in his appointed place ready to render useful service, and at the end of which—and then only—he is at liberty to leave that place. By analogy it would seem fair to count the time of the dredge worker as beginning when the dredge pump is started or the dredge dipper makes its first swing and as ending when actual dredging stops at the end of the day.

8. The bill, if passed, will apply to the construction and repair of levees and revetments on navigable rivers of the United States, whether done by hired labor or by contract, and will thus operate to nullify the exception made with regard to contracts for such work in the act approved June 19, 1912 (Public, No. 199, H. R. 9061, this Congress). Moreover, as amended by the committee it will prevent the practice followed in some places of beginning work early and "laying off" for more than one hour in the heat of the day.

9. Another feature of the matter is the fact that the bill as drawn will apply the eight-hour law with the nine-consecutive-hour limit strictly to all members of the crews of all vessels employed on river and harbor work, including not only dredges but dispatch boats, tugboats, inspection boats, and work boats of all kinds. These men are universally admitted to be seamen and are now subject to the same c

pretations of the law they are less favored than men in similar lines of work on shore.

10. In view of the considerations above advanced, it is suggested that if the bill be passed it be first amended by the omission of the committee amendment requiring every man's work to be completed within nine consecutive hours, and by changing the phraseology "all persons * * employed * * in constructing, maintaining, and improving a river and harbor," so as to make it apply only to operators of dredging machinery who live on shore and simply go on board the dredge during the day to perform their day's work. This will accomplish the purpose for which the bill was introduced without involving far-reaching complications, the extent of which can not be fully seen. It will distinguish between persons who are engaged without involving for the mechanical work of digging a channel and persons who are engaged to navigate vessels; and it will avoid singling out the employees of one department of the Government for special favor above employees of similar classes who do similar work for other branches of the Government service.

W. H. Bixby,

W. H. BIXBY, Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

[Memorandum on H. R. 18787, which is a bill to amend the eight-hour law of August 1, 1892.]

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, July 30, 1912.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,

Washington, July 30, 1912.

1. The following amendments are recommended:
a. In line 10, page 2, change "and" to "or," to agree with phraseology in other parts of bill.
b. In line 9, page 2, strike out "in constructing, maintaining, or improving a" and substitute "to perform services similar to those of
laborers and mechanics in connection with dredging (snagging, or rock
excavation), in any," so as to make the clause read, "and of all persons
who are now or may hereafter be employed by the Government of the
United States or the District of Columbia, or any contractor or subcontractor, to perform services similar to those of laborers and mechanics in connection with dredging (snagging, or rock excavation), in any
river or harbor of the United States or of the District of Columbia.
Same amendment in lines 17-18, and in line 21, page 2, and in lines
8-9, and in lines 23-24, page 3.

Note.—The object of the bill is to bring within the protection of the
eight-hour law the dredge workers who by the decision of the Supreme
Court on May 13, 1907, were declared not to be "laborers or mechanies employed on any of the public works of the United States" within
the meaning of the act of August 1, 1892. The amendment suggested
will cover these men without going so far as to embrace a large variety
of other employees the conditions of whose employment are such that
they do not need the protection of the proposed law.

c. In line 13, page 2, after "workday," insert "except in the case
of service which is by its nature noncontinuous, or which requires only
a portion of the employee's time, or which is required only for brief
periods, at intervals," so as to make the clause read, "which eight
hours shall terminate within hine hours from beginning of workday,"
except in the case of service which is by its nature noncontinuous, or
which this bill is designed to cover, the time and attention of the employee must be given to the work from the time he begins work in the
morning until he

preserving the general intent of the bill, will avoid complications in the employment of these classes of persons.

d. At the end of section 1, page 2, add the following: "Provided, That nothing in this act shall apply or be construed to apply to persons performing directory, supervisory, technical, clerical, or subtlerical dutles, nor to masters, pilots, mates, or other persons duly articled as seamen, whose service is governed by the general navigation laws."

Note.—This amendment is suggested to take out of the operation of the act positions of the class which the proponents and advocates of the bill apparently had no intention of covering; also the masters and crews (other than the dredge workers) of vessels regularly in commission when governed by the general navigation laws. A bill (H. R. 23673) amending the general laws for the regulation of the employment of seamen is now before the House; and the provisions of H. R. 18757, which would apply the eight-hour law with the nine consecutive hour limit to seamen engaged in river and harbor work, are in conflict with those of H. R. 23673 governing seamen in general. Should H. R. 18787 be passed without amendment, it would put seamen who may be employed in connection with rivers and harbor work on a different basis from other seamen and would prevent the use of the ordinary watch-and-watch system which is universally recognized and which is provided for in H. R. 23673, and would require seamen on river and harbor work to work eight hours consecutively instead of four hours on and four hours off, as contemplated by the general navigation laws. It is believed that all persons covered by this proposed amendment render services of a character which should reasonably be excepted from the rigid requirements of the bill as drawn, especially from the limitation of service to nine consecutive hours; for example, men in supervisory positions, who do no manual labor, but who may have office work to do or reports to make after hours; clerks, whose employment is governed by

W. H. BIXBY, Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to add that it seems to me that if this bill passes the House in its present shape it is going to work a great hardship on the Government. It will not only cost the Government a great deal more, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the engineers, but it is going to embarrass them very materially in carrying on certain classes of river and harbor work. The amendment which the gentle-man says he is willing to accept will not meet the entire situation. It would meet a part of it, to be sure, but not all. I had hoped that he would accept not only that amendment, but others of a similar nature suggested by the Chief of Engineers, and a copy of which I furnished to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] this morning.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman that I have no objection, so far as I am concerned, to amendment "A" in that document furnished by the War Department, or amendment "B"; and certain amendments to amendment "D" I would be perfectly willing to agree to; but to amendment "C," which is the one the gentleman just

suggested, I am opposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida

[Mr. Sparkman] has expired.

Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Chairman, I suggest—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move that the time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sparkman] be extended five minutes.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. The CHAIRMAN. MOORE] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Florida be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would then offer as an amendment, in line 10, page 2, changing "and" to "or."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] that there is an amendment pending, and when that amendment is disposed of his amendment will be entertained.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.
Mr. SABATH. Did I understand him correctly to state a few moments ago that the Engineer Department was opposed to the

eight-hour work?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not in any sense of the word. As I understand it, they are in favor of all reasonable application of the eight-hour principle. But they are of the impression, in fact they are pretty firmly convinced, that this bill, as we are proposing to pass it here, would work a great hardship on the Government in certain kinds of river and harbor work.

Mr. SABATH. How many hours do the engineers work a

Mr. SPARKMAN. I can not say as to that, but I think Gen. Bixby and some of the other gentlemen there work 16 hours a day. I fancy I am safe in saying they work more than 8 hours.

Mr. SABATH. Gen. Bixby and the rest of them?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, the clerks there, perhaps, do not. Mr. SABATH. Then I would say they are overworked and need some relief.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am inclined to believe that. And I have no doubt the gentleman himself is overworked. He works more than eight hours a day. But that is neither here nor there.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this class of legislation. have no objection to an eight-hour workday. I think the principle is sound economically and is beneficial to all. I believe that wherever it can be applied to workmen it ought to be applied, and in most cases of continuous work it can easily be applied; but in certain classes of river and harbor work it is not easy of application and would work a hardship on some. In many cases the employee works intermittently a few minutes and then stops for perhaps an hour or two. So that it would be difficult to apply the eight-hour principle or this nine-hour provision to them without entailing a hardship upon the Gov-

ernment or its contractor, which is the same thing.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. not exactly understand the amendment that he suggested that he would not object to. I do not have it before me, and I want to ask the gentleman this question: On the Mississippi River they have what are called "range lights" in the river. There is a man employed by the Government to see that these lights are lighted at night and put out in the morning. Now, more than nine hours will elapse between the time the man goes to put them out in the morning and the time when he goes back to light them again in the evening, but it will take perhaps only an hour or two in the morning and perhaps only an hour or two in the evening. Now, the gentleman, I understand, is willing to accept the amendment as offered. I want to ask the gentleman whether under that amendment that class of contractors would be excepted from this nine-hour limitation.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. If they come within the construction of "laborers and mechanics," they would not be ex-

empted, and they would still be included.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman understands that a man takes a contract, as I understand it, to keep these lights burning, and he is paid so much, a very small compensation—as I recall, \$10 a month. But he takes a contract with the Government, and it is in relation to the improve-

ment of the navigation of our rivers.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. That part is stricken out in the amendment, and it is only work in relation to dredging, snagging, or rock excavation that would be included in the The other works in connection with rivers and harbors would be excluded, and the maintenance would be excluded from the operation of it. Nothing would be included except the dredging and snagging and excavation, as the intent and purpose of the authors of the bill and the committee was to apply the eight-hour workday to the dredgemen, because the Supreme Court had held that they were not laborers or mechanics, but were seamen, and consequently the general eighthour law did not apply to them. Fersonally I have no objection to the bill being amended so that it applies to the dredging work alone.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Under the amendment, as I understand the gentleman, this lamplighter would not, in his opinion, be limited by this nine-hour provsion? The same man could go in the morning and put the lamp out and return in the afternoon to light it, more than nine hours apart?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. That would not, in my judg-

ment, be considered as work in connection with snagging and dredging and rock excavation; and it not being either of these three, it would not change existing law as applying to them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, may we have

that amendment reported?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has already been reported, but the Clerk will again report it.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Humphreys] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

Add, after the word "emergency," in line 24, page 2, the following proviso: "Provided, That the construction or repair of levees or revetments necessary for protection against floods or overflows on the navigable waters of the United States shall be considered to be extraordinary emergency work within the meaning of this act."

Mr. HUMPEREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in the river and harbor bill which has recently become a law this provision was carried, because the House believed that that character of work was extraordinary emergency work. In the eight-hour law which was passed by the House a few weeks ago, known as the Hughes bill, there was also a provision, incorporated in the Senate and agreed to by the House, which excepted from the eight-hour limitation work done on levees and revetments to prevent floods on the navigable streams of the

Contractors who are engaged in this work believed that that was emergency work, because there are only a few months in the year in which such work can be done on the levees to protect the country from overflow, and they proceeded upon the theory that that was always emergency work. But the Supreme Court, last fall, in construing that statute, said that as it was a continuing emergency, an emergency that was always present, as the work of levee building was continuous, in the opinion of the court Congress did not intend to except it by the use of the words "extraordinary emergency," and it therefore declared that all levee work came within the limitations of the eight-hour law.

As a matter of fact, whatever it may be as a matter of law, the building of levees to protect the country from floods is an extraordinary emergency, because there are only a few months in the year when this work can be done. We have all seen in the past few months what calamitous results may follow if the work is not prosecuted, and prosecuted vigorously, in the months in which it can be done.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi yield

to the gentleman from Pennsylvania? Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. BOWMAN. If the work described by the gentleman is continuous, why is it not possible to have three shifts of eight

hours each? Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. It is. It is possible to have three shifts of eight hours always on all work. There never was any extraordinary emergency where it was not possible to have three shifts of eight hours each. The question is not whether it is possible or not. The question is whether

it is desirable to require it.

Gentlemen will understand that this work is in no way performed by skilled labor. It is performed, as a rule, by the farmers in the neighborhood. It simply consists in hauling dirt and dumping it onto the levees. Unless it can be done in the months when there is no high water and before the rainy senson sets in it can not be done in time. This year the conditions proved to be calamitous to such an extent that at one time the Secretary of War reported that he was feeding and housing 160,000 people who had been rendered homeless by the breaks in the levees.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think the words "except in case of extraordinary emergency" cover the very point he makes? I think the bill covers his point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. SISSON. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] asks unanimous consent that his colleague [Mr. Hum-PHREYS | have five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It seems to me that the gentleman's amendment is already covered by the bill. The gentleman cites the particular instance of the levees of the Mississippi River. There might be emergencies in other places, so that the specification of the Mississippi River in the bill might work a hardship in other extraordinary emergencies.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The amendment does not specify the Mississippi River. It refers to all rivers, and it is the exact language which the House incorporated into the recent eight-hour law, and it is the language which we put into the river and harbor bill, because we believed as a matter of fact that this is extraordinary emergency work, although the court, very properly, perhaps, decided under the language of the law that it is not extraordinary emergency work.

Mr. BOWMAN. Will the gentleman yield for one other question?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes. Mr. BOWMAN. The present speaker has had some experience in the sort of work the gentleman speaks of, and it is very exhausting. I do not think any man ought to be kept at that kind of work more than eight hours.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman understands that you can not require anybody to work on that kind of work more than eight hours unless he wants to do it; but the little farmers around there, when they lay by their crops, are all very anxious to get at this work, and they start out in the morning

early; and if they can work only eight hours they have to cease work long before sundown, knowing that the two or three hours during which they must remain idle may mean that the floods will come down the river and break the levees and destroy their

As to the three shifts of men, of course you can not build levees at night. It would be out of the question to undertake to light up that whole levee line so that they could work at night.

They simply work in the daytime.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Right there on that point, does not the gentleman think the last two lines on page 2 of this bill cover the very proposition which the gentleman speaks of? Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. No.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Except in extraordinary

emergencies.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I thought so, and we undertook in that way to allow more than eight hours' work. The parties were indicted and the case finally got to the Supreme Court of the United States, and they held that the building of levees to prevent floods along the Mississippi River was not extraordinary emergency work. Whatever the facts are, the court has held that to be the law. I hope there will be no objection to this amendment. We put it in the river and harbor bill we put it in the other side harbor law to the put it in the river and harbor bill we put it in the other side harbor. bill, we put it in the other eight-hour law, and certainly nothing has arisen since then to make it less desirable now than it has been in the past, when it was placed on these other two bills. I hope therefore that the House will agree to put it in this bill, just as they wrote it into both of the others.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this

amendment, for the reason that the bill now provides for the exception of extraordinary emergency work. The statement of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Humphreys] leads me to believe that the amendment put in the river and harbor bill was not for an emergency. Where there was a real emergency, and it was necessary to work 10 or 12 hours a day in order to save life and property, that probably could be done; but from the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] it appears that this work is only made emergency work owing to the fact that that amendment went into the bill. It seems to me this provision in the present bill is ample to protect extraordinary emergency work—that is, work which needs to be expedited in order to save life and property. As I understand it, ordinary levee work is not extraordinary emergency work. It is not necessary to work more than one shift, and therefore, in my judgment, the eight-hour law ought to apply to it. If we are going to make this an exception, we probably will have a demand in the near future for another eight-hour bill. By all means let us try to get this bill so that it will apply to Government work and cover all that is intended to be covered by Congress, and not let amendments be inserted here which, in my judgment, would annul the law so far as levee work is concerned. In a case where it is necessary to protect life and property, where there is a great flood threatened, or where, as recently occurred, the levees are destroyed and the water is overflowing the country, destroying property and creating a condition that is unhealthful and will result in preventing farmers from raising crops, that is an emergency. That is why I made no objection in regard to the present levee work, caused, as I understand it, by the washing out of the levees, which makes it necessary to strengthen them and make them higher. Where it is necessary to make the levees higher it does not seem to me to be extraordinary emergency work, and if it is this bill is sufficient, where it says that extraordinary emergency work shall be excepted.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield until I can ask a question of the gentleman from Mississippi? Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can get time

in his own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended for five minutes,

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago we passed a law limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States, and so forth, and provided that in every contract made hereafter in which the United States, and so forth, was a party, a provision for an eight-hour limitation should be incorporated. In that law we made the exception that it should not apply to contracts for the construction or repair of levees or revetments necessary for protection against floods or overflows on the navigable waters of the United States.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That was a Senate amendment, was it

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Yes; to which the House unanimously agreed. If the United States can contract for this kind of work without incorporating in the contract this eight-hour limitation, why should the eight-hour limitation then be applied to the man who makes the contract with the Government? It occurs to me that if it was good policy then—and that was only on the 19th of June last that the bill was approved—to incorporate that provision in the bill, it certainly ought not to be objectionable now.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that that was accepted, I believe, by those who were interested in the bill because they feared further delay and possible defeat of the bill. It was acquiesced in because of the fact they thought if they made an effort to secure the approval of the Senate to the bill as they wanted it it would probably result in delay and possibly in defeating it. So far as this eight-hour law is concerned, I want to say that it has been demonstrated time and again that more work can be obtained in that way than with a longer day. Much has been said here about the farmer. I honestly believe, from the information I have from the votes on this question, that if it were left to the farmers they would vote for an eight-hour law. In Colorado and New York, where this question of eight hour or shorter workday has been voted on by the people, so that the State constitution might be revised to permit the enactment of an eight-hour law, the vote has been in favor of the eight-hour law almost three to one, and I have no knowledge of any vote that has ever been taken on that question, when it has been put clearly to the people, that has not been carried by a large majority.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I am not aware, of course, of that situation, and the gentleman is, as to the modus operandi by which this amendment was agreed to on the other eight-hour bill. The gentleman states that it was put on there in order to prevent objection and further delay to the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say the same thing was done in regard to the date it was to take effect—the 1st of January. Those who were interested in it wanted it to take effect at an earlier date than that, but rather than take any chances they accepted the Senate amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman think it entirely fair if that is true, if the other eight-hour bill was passed through the House by agreeing to exempt this particular work from the eight-hour limitation that we should now put it in another bill and apply it?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I say that I think it is fair to try and get an effective eight-hour law which Congress formerly in-

tended and which the people want and this House favors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have just looked at the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi and I feel that it is an amendment that ought to be opposed and defeated. It would defeat to a large extent the very purpose for which this bill is intended. We adopted an eight-hour law for certain Government employees, in the Post Office, on public works, and elsewhere, and now propose to extend that law to those who work on dredges, who by reason of a Supreme Court decision have been held not correctly designated as laborers. This bill proposes to cover that provision of the Supreme Court decision. If this amendment be adopted, it means that we take out of the category of laborers entitled to an eight-hour day the men who must necessarily be employed on permanent works protecting the banks of rivers against floods. It refers not only to the men who will work by the hundreds and thousands building up the levees and revetments along the Mississippi in times of flood and distress but those who work on every other river throughout the country, which rivers by reason of legislation and the ordinary processes of the engineers' office, will be protected against flood when there is no flood. If the amendment meant that we were to except those laborers who were called suddenly while the waters were flowing in, threatening to destroy human life and property, the situation would be different. It applies to any permanent work begun this year or any other time by way of precaution against floods that may happen next year or a hundred years hence. It is not an emergency amendment, and, if adopted, will release from the provisions of the eighthour law thousands of men who will be engaged upon permanent work not only on the Mississippi but on all the other rivers of the country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to see the House take a backward step on the eight-hour proposition. I appreciate the difficulty which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Hum-PHREYS] has stated to the House in reference to levee work, and yet the existing law applies to laborers in that class of work. To now provide that that class of labor should be excepted from the law, it seems to me, would be taking a backward step. The law now applies to laborers on river and harbor work. The purpose of this bill is to make it apply to these men who are called by the Supreme Court, and I have no doubt that that is correct, seamen; but to say that it shall not apply to laborers in the future is to say that Congress is endeavoring to repeal that provision of the law that has been on the statute books for many years.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The law that passed in

June excepts this work.

Mr. MANN. The law that we passed in June excepts this work, but that law specifically provides, if I remember correctly, that it shall not take out from under the eight-hour law anyone who is included under the eight-hour law under this original act. It does not repeal any provision of the original

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. But it provides that such contracts need not embrace this eight-hour limitation.

Mr. MANN. Under that law; but the original eight-hour law passed in 1891 or 1892, I believe, expressly applies to contracts with laborers, employees either by the Government or by contractors, and puts that labor on the eight-hour basis and it has been on an eight-hour basis all that time. Now, as to emergency work like happened this spring. The eight-hour law does not apply to that case. That is a case of extraordinary emergency

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. We have proceeded ever since 1892 and have always proceeded upon the theory that levee building was an extraordinary emergency work, and we proceeded upon that theory until the past year, when the Supreme Court decided otherwise. Thereupon the very first opportunity which arose where the matter was pertinent this Congress excepted levee work in the river and harbor bill, and then in the first eight-hour law afterwards we excepted it, and it occurs to me, having ascertained that this is not emergency work, which we have heretofore thought it was, it would be no step backward now to declare the law to be what we thought it was all the while.

Mr. MANN. I will say there was no vote in the House on that proposition as an amendment of the eight-hour law recently passed here or as an amendment to the river and harbor

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. There was no objection. Mr. MANN. Both items were inserted in the Senate or in conference, and the House never had a chance at all.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The matter was called

to the attention of the House by the gentleman from Illinois himself.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but I was not willing to vote against the conference report on the river and harbor bill, knowing prob-

ably we would have a chance to take care of it on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, if there has been an exception in connection with construction work on levees and revetment not occurring while the water is forcing its way through them, it is time it was changed in the interest of humanity. The report on this bill states very distinctly:

At the present stage of the discussion of reducing the hours of the workday it is no longer necessary to set out to prove the benefits to mankind gained everywhere in industrial life through cutting off all the hours of employment above eight.

That character of employment is very exhausting work, and I do not think there should be any exception made in this case. A vote should be had in this House to decide whether or not such an exception should be made.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that all debate on this section close in five minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. Shackleford having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

S. 7209. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at the town site of Sartell, Minn.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its

appropriate committee, as indicated below: 8.7209. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at the town site of Sartell, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LIMITATION OF HOURS OF EMPLOYEES ON PUBLIC WORKS.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected. Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman in charge of the bill is willing to accept some amendments which—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman rise to offer an amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am going to offer the following amendment: In line 10, page 2, change the word "and" to "or."

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Florida send his

amendment to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have not the amendment written.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Perhaps I can help the gentleman from Florida, if his amendment is to line 9, page 2. If the gentleman will permit me, I will offer this amendment which I think is what he wants.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 8, amend, by striking out the words "in constructing, maintaining, or improving a" and substitute the following: "to perform services similar to those of laborers and mechanics in connection with dredging (snagging or rock excavation) in any."

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I would ask the gentleman from Florida to strike out the parentheses. It seems to me the parentheses ought to be stricken out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think that is very proper.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. With that change, I have no

objection to it.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman quite sure that will accomplish what the Supreme Court has decided to be seamen on barges? As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it provides that all persons engaged in work similar to that performed by laborers or mechanics in dredging, snagging, and so forth. The Supreme Court has held, I think properly, that men operating upon a dredge on the water are not laboners and are not mechanics, but are under the designation of seamen. statutes and elsewhere say they are seamen.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman permit me

to read two sentences which will answer his question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The object of the bill is to bring within the protection of the eight-hour law the dredge workers who by the decision of the Supreme Court on May 13, 1907, were declared not to be "laborers or mechanics employed on any of the public works of the United States" within the meaning of the act of August 1, 1892. The amendment suggested will cover these men without going so far as to embrace a large variety of other employees, the conditions of whose employment are such that they do not need the protection of the proposed law.

Mr. MANN. Whose decision is this?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, I have always believed, Mr. Chairman, that the Engineers of the United States Army are very careful students of the law and make very few moves without they are thoroughly advised. It happens that this is an expression from the Chief of the United States Army Engineers.

Mr. MANN. I have very great respect for his learning as an engineer and his learning as a lawyer, yet I am not entirely clear that the expression "persons performing work similar to

laborers" would include seamen.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. In my judgment, it would not include a seaman in the ordinary sense of the term " but it would include that class of workmen in dredging work in our rivers and harbors who had prior to that time been considered as laborers and mechanics, but which under the decision of the Supreme Court were decided to be seamen, such as the firemen and the engineers and the laborers in connection with the dredging operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida

[Mr. SPARKMAN] has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended five

Mr. MANN. I thought I had the floor, but I yield it. The Chair had started to put the question on the amendment,

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs the gentleman's pardon. The gentleman from Illinois did have the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] that I do not think those words embrace seamen in any sense. I think the language is drawn for the purpose of including seamen. There is a large class of employees who work on dredges that are not seamen in any sense.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And are not seamen in any

sense.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the trouble we encounter and the necessity for this bill is that the Supreme Court has rendered a decision that they are seamen. If they are, I think there are some grounds for doubting whether this is a wise amendment to which to agree. Any way, it makes it uncertain to me whether or not it will cover the grounds we wish it to cover, taking into consideration the decision as rendered by the Supreme Court. Is not the purpose of this to exclude cooks, waiters, watchmen, and so forth?

Mr. SPARKMAN. All such employees as those; yes. Those

who work on dredges, for instance, and in similar work.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And lock tenders? Why could we not have an amendment excluding cooks, waiters, lock tenders, and so forth?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I took this amendment as it was given me by the engineers and submitted it to the gentleman this morning. I did not know he had any serious objection to it at that time. If he had I would have tried to

have it conform to his views.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am in harmony with the purposes of this amendment. As I stated the other day, it seems to me it is difficult, due to the rulings of the department officials and judges, to know just what we can put in to make it a workable law. It would be construed the other way sufficiently, I suppose, to let them "lubricate" it, but when it comes to getting benefit for the workmen, and reduce hours, and better conditions it is mighty hard to get the law applied as it was intended by the creators of the law.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. May I ask the gentleman

from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] a question?
The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do. Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. In the work on the Mississippi River particularly—and I suppose it is true on a great many other public works—they use a great many teams. The contractor hires men to take care of them-to feed them early in the morning, for instance. Under your amendment, if it is agreed to, will it be unlawful for a man to feed the teams in the morning and feed them again at night, or does your amendment except them from this nine hours limitation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not sure that it would go as far as that. Perhaps it ought to, but the amendment that would have covered that feature is one that the gentlemen in charge of the bill will not accept. They are willing, as I understand, to accept this particular amendment, which very likely does not

go to the extent the gentleman suggests.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The amendment that is now pending does not include teamsters?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does not refer to teamsters.
Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Is it the purpose of the gentleman when this is disposed of to offer an amendment to the bill which does make it possible for the contractor to employ a man lawfully to feed the teams in the morning and

also to feed them at night?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The provision that I offered awhile ago embraced that class of employees. But I do not propose to offer any amendments here which those in charge of the bill

will not accept.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The gentleman, I understood, did not offer it, but had some discussion with the gentle-man from Pennsylvania [Mr. Wilson] on the subject. Is it

mot his intention to offer such an amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not wish to offer an amendment which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Wilson] will not accept, and I understand he does not feel inclined to accept an amendment such as that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to say if the gentle-

man from Florida does not offer the amendment, I will.

Mr. MANN. That was an amendment to the amendment. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It does not meet the emergency raised by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Hum-PHREYS

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Just a moment. I want to protect that by another amendment. In line 10, page 2, change the word "and" to the word "or."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I have no objection to the

amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 10, by striking out the word "and" and inserting the word "or."

Mr. MANN. What is the purpose of that amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The intention is to make it agree to the amendment just adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sparkman].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 13, by inserting after the word "workday" the following: "Except in the case of service which is by its nature noncontinuous or which requires only a portion of the employee's time, and which is required only for brief periods at intervals."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Wilson] object to the adoption of this amendment?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I certainly do. It would de-

stroy the entire purpose of the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then, in support of the amend-ment, I will simply read the reasons that are given by the department for the amendment to the bill. I am heartily in favor of the passage of this bill. It is a good measure and yet there are some features that might be advantageously added. fore I submit these suggestions to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. Wilson] and to the House. I read:

vania [Mr. Wilson] and to the House. I read:

In the ordinary case of regular, continuous, manual labor which this bill is designed to cover the time and attention of the employee must be given to the work from the time he begins work in the morning until he quits at night, except for the noon stop for dinner. There are, however, many cases among "all persons employed in constructing, maintaining, or improving a river or harbor" in which the work is necessarily intermittent, and the employee has time during the day that is at his own disposal for his own private affairs, or in which incidental service of minor character must be rendered before or after hours. Among employees of this character are cooks, cooks' helpers, waiters, servants, messengers, day and night watchmen, lock masters, and lock employees; light keepers on the western rivers, whose duty it is to light the lights at nightfall and extinguish them in the morning and keep the lamps cleaned and filled ready for service; teamsters, who are required to feed their horses in the morning before beginning work and again in the evening after working hours; firemen, who start boilers in the morning before regular hours; and others. The proposed amendment, while preserving the general intent of the bill, will avoid complications in the employment of these classes of persons.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are the reasons assigned by officers

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are the reasons assigned by officers of the Government who have charge of these public works, and it does seem to me that in the instances given perhaps there ought to be some latitude; where, for instance, a man is employed to come in and light the fires in the boilers in the morning, and goes away and then comes back and banks them at night; or, in the case referred to by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Humphreys], where a man is employed to feed the horses one hour, and then goes away and comes back later and feeds them again. It seems to me these are cases where there might fairly be an exception and where the department ought to have some discretion, especially since a penalty is imposed upon the employing officer-a penalty which involves fine and imprisonment.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the difficulty with the amendment submitted by the gentleman is that it covers a great deal more than is cited in the letter that he has just quoted from. It not only covers men who have to start the fires in the morning in the boiler room, before the day's work in general begins, and to the stablemen and hostlers and to the lock tenders who are employed only a part of the time, but it also includes all of the men employed on the dredges; and I want to quote from the same letter that the gentleman quoted from in order to show that the officers in charge realize that fact. In that letter this statement is made:

This matter was only examined into in connection with dredging operations on the Great Lakes last year, and the reports from all the officers in charge of such work were unanimously to the effect that under the present conditions of operation no man on either the dredges or the tugs does regularly more than eight hours' actual work in the course of a working day, and that from two to three hours or more of the period between the time he is called to work in the morning and the time he quits work at night are lost through the causes mentioned.

So that, if the exception that the gentleman proposes is included in the bill, it will not only take with it the hostlers and stablemen and lock tenders, but it will also take with it the dredgemen, the very men that are sought to be reached by this bill. I hope, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he takes his seat?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania

yield to his colleague?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Yes.
Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I happen to know that there is sometimes great difficulty in the matter of serving meals on dredges. How would the gentleman, as an officer, regard the duty of a man who waits on the table during the meal hours?

How would you enforce the eight-hour rule? Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. So far as the culinary department is concerned, I do not see why an eight-hour workday should not apply, although we have not reached that stage as yet. I do not see why it should apply to lock tenders, who have only a brief period of time each day to apply to the work. I do not see any reason why it should apply to the stablemen and men of that kind, and I have no desire to make it apply to them. But when it comes to the culinary department in every large institution engaged in dredging operations, the men employed in the culinary department are actively on duty from 14 to 16 hours a day, they being on duty before the regular day's work begins, making ready to get the meals for the men, and afterwards to clean up the kitchen and dining room after the day's operations are over. So that I see no reason why we could not apply it in a practical way to the men engaged in the culinary department, and keep two shifts, of 8 hours each, engaged for 16 hours. As to the other men that I mentioned, there is no urgent necessity for including them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But there are instances where there might be no service rendered at all, unless you took a man whose services were intermittent for an hour or two and engaged him for eight hours.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Then that would be covered

by this bill. It would be an emergency.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS. Is it not a fact, sir, as developed in the hearings that took place on this bill before the committee, that almost everybody connected with the work, except the supervising foremen, worked intermittently, and that none of them work continuously? And is it not therefore a fact that the exceptions sought to be introduced would prove the rule for all these employees?

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. That is true, Mr. Chairman, and that is what I have been trying to impress upon the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore], that his amendment would not only include the men who are cited in the quotation he makes, but would include all the men engaged in dredging operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman

from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected. Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 24, add, after the word "emergency," the following: "Provided, That nothing in this act shall apply or be construed to apply to persons performing directory, supervisory, or clerical duties, nor to masters, pilots, or mates, or other persons duly articled as seamen, whose service is governed by the general navigation laws."

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will strike out that part of his amendment beginning with the word "or" and the remainder of it, I will be perfectly willing to accept it.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. That is all. I will consent

to that modification. Mr. MANN. I should like to have the amendment reported as modified.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 24, after the word "emergency," insert the following: "Provided, That nothing in this act shall apply or be construed to apply to persons performing directory, supervisory, or clerical duties, nor to masters, pilots, or mates."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I should like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana whether he will accept the words "technical or subclerical" as an amendment to his amendment.

Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana. I have no objection to accepting those words, but the gentlemen in charge of the bill do object to them, and I think it is a pretty good amendment in its present form. Therefore I do not insist on putting in those

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, in line 17, after the word "or," where it occurs the second time, to insert the words "of such."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment which the Chairman from Illinois offers an amendment which the Chairman from Illinois offers and the chairman from Illinois offers

amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 17, page 2, by inserting, after the second word "or," the ords "of such."

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will notice that the words "or persons employed in constructing" are an insert in the original law. If this bill should be enacted in its present form, without inserting those words, it would eliminate the eight-hour law from laborers or mechanics engaged in anything except river and harbor work.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the

amendment.

The amendment was agreed to. Mr. MANN. Then, I move, in line 20, after the word "or,"

where it occurs the second time, to strike out the word "persons" and insert the words "any such person." The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 20, strike out the word "persons" and insert the words "any such person."

Mr. MANN. That amendment is offered for the same reason. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last

We adopted an amendment in line 9 a while ago, striking out the words "in constructing, maintaining, or improving a" making an insert in place of it. To make that at all effective it will, of course, have to be carried through the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I understood that amendments were to be offered wherever those words occur.

Mr. MANN. That is the reason I call attention to it. In

line 21 the same thing comes in.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. It occurs in two other places besides that, and I understood that amendments were to be offered at those points.

Mr. KENDALL. In line 18. Mr. MANN. In line 18 and in line 21.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think an amendment of that kind is very proper.

Mr. MANN. It does not mean anything without it.

WILSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman expect to follow up his amendments at the points suggested?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I had not intended doing so, but I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Of course, unless it is offered, the section does

not mean anything after we get through with it. I do not care to offer the amendment. Let the gentleman do it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, in line 18, I move to strike out the words "in constructing, maintaining, or improving a" and insert the words "to perform services similar to those of laborers and mechanics in connection with dredging, snagging, or rock excavation in any.'

Mr. MANN. I suggest that the gentleman ask unanimous consent to strike out the same words in lines 18 and 21 that were stricken out in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof the same

amendment that was inserted in line 9.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is perfectly satisfactory.
The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 18, by striking out the words "in constructing, maintaining, or improving a" and insert in lieu thereof the words "to perform services similar to those of laborers and mechanics in connection with dredging, snagging, or rock excavation in any."

The amendment was agreed to.
Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the same amendment apply in line 21.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent

that the same amendment apply in line 21. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

VIOLATION OF ACT BY OFFICER OR CONTRACTOR PUNISHABLE.

VIOLATION OF ACT BY OFFICER OR CONTRACTOR PUNISHABLE.

SEC. 2. That any officer or agent of the Government of the United States or of the District of Columbia, or any contractor or subcontractor whose duty it shall be to employ, direct, or control any laborer or mechanic employed upon a public work of the United States or of the District of Columbia, or any person employed in constructing, maintaining, or improving a river or harbor of the United States or of the District of Columbia, who shall intentionally violate any provision of this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and for each and every such offense shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine not to exceed \$1,000, or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court having jurisdiction thereof.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the same amendment that was agreed to, in lines 17 and 18 and line 21 on page 2, be agreed to as applying

to lines 8 and 9 on page 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the amendment agreed to in lines 17 and 18 and line 21 on page 2 be agreed to as applying to lines 8 and 9 on page 3. Is there objection? Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. [After a pause.] The

The Clerk read as follows:

EXISTING CONTRACTS NOT AFFECTED BY ACT.

SEC. 3. That the provisions of this act shall not be so construed as to in any manner apply to or affect contractors or subcontractors, or to limit the hours of daily service of laborers or mechanics engaged upon a public work of the United States or of the District of Columbia, or persons employed in constructing, maintaining, or improving a river or harbor of the United States or of the District of Columbia, for which contracts have been entered into prior to the passing of this act.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which was agreed to as applying to lines 17, 18, and line 21 on page 2 be agreed to as applying to lines 23 and 24 on page 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The

Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Page, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 18787 and had instructed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse. [After a pause.] The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.
The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time. was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. Langley, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. Hughes of Georgia, for two days, on account of sickness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 5545. An act providing for patents on reclamation entries, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, August 1, 1912, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule III,

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 70) to constitute a commission to investigate the purchase of American-grown tobacco by the governments of foreign countries, reported the

same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1118) which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill, (H. R. 25987) to grant an annuity to Annie Neate, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions,

PUBLIC BILLS. RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials

were introduced and severally referred as follows:
By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 26059) to create a board of river regulation and to provide a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of navigable rivers in aid of interstate commerce, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection and for the beneficial use of flood waters and for water storage and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires and for the cooperation of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 26060) for the relief of persons suffering damages by reason of the construction of the canal diverting the waters of the Mormon Slough into the

Calaveras River; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 26061) to amend the general pension act of May 11, 1912; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

By Mr. POU; A bill (H. R. 26062) providing for the erection of a statue of Gen. Robert E. Lee, and also a Lincoln peace memorial arch over Pennsylvania Avenue, in the city of Wash-

ington; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 26063) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means. By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 26064) to provide for the

purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Noblesville, in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26065) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Lebanon, in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 26066) supplementing the joint resolution of Congress approved April 30, 1908, entitled "Joint resolution instructing the Attorney General to institute certain suits," etc.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution (H. Res. 655) authorizing and directing the Committee on Irrigation to ascertain the present condition of the Garden City irrigation project, located in Finney County, Kans., and all matters contained in S. 6784, and to make report to the House; to the Committee on Rules. By Mr. GRAY: Resolution (H. Res. 656) authorizing the

payment of a certain sum of money to Grace G. Jackson; to the

Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FOSTER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 343) authorizing Federal bureaus doing hygienic and demographic work to participate in the exhibition to be held in connection with the Fifteenth International Congress on Hygiene and Demography; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions

were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 26067) granting a pension to Susan King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26068) for the relief of John Samsel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26069) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Clawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 26070) granting a pension to

George W. Platter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 26071) granting a pension to Dora White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 26072) granting an increase of pension to Abel Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 26073) granting an increase of pension to Alben Swearingen; to the

Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 26074) authorizing the Secretary of War to confer upon Joseph Milton Heller the congressional medal of honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 26075) for the relief of George G. Harris and others; to the Committée on Claims.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 26076) granting a pension to Mary Catharine Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 26077) granting an increase of pension to Mary Brush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. By Mr. PEPPER: A bill (H. R. 26078) for the relief of Charles S. Kincaid; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 26079) granting a pension to Charles Rosenkranz; to the Committee on Invalid

Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 26080) granting an increase of pension to Salome A. Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 26081) granting a pension to William H. Watson; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid

on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CALDER: Memorial of the new Seattle Chamber of Commerce, of Seattle, Wash, favoring an investigation of the foreign and domestic fire insurance corporations of the United

States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. By Mr. DIFENDERFER: Petition of Max Gress with reference to a decision given in his case; to the Committee on In-

valid Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of the Committee of Wholesale Grocers of New York City, favoring reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Fourteenth Street Store; the Simpson-Crawford Co.; New York Typographical Union, No. 6; and Photo-Engravers' Union, No. 1, of New York City, against passage of the Bourne parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the 'Allied Printing Trades' Council of New York State, against passage of the Bourne parcel-post bill; to

the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: Petition for the relief of George G. Harris and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARRAN: Paper in support of bill (H. R. 20456)

granting a pension to Mary Muller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Robert Morris Council, No. 41, Order of Independent Americans, of Germantown. Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of bill (H. R. 25309) requiring the flag of the United States to be displayed on all lighthouses of the United States and insular possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Evidence in support of claim, to accompany House bill 26054, for relief of estate of John M. Wright, of Madison County, Ala.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SABATH: Memorial of the Polish societies of Chicago, Ill., against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the new Seattle Chamber of Commerce, of Seattle, Wash., favoring passage of House bill 357, relative to investigation of foreign and domestic fire insurance companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of the Ladies' Auxiliary of the International Association of Machinists, of Den-Colo., against the treatment of the textile workers in the strike at Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, August 1, 1912.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D. Mr. BACON took the chair as President pro tempore under the order of the Senate of July 29, 1912.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved. ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION (S. DOC. NO. 889).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. Bacon) laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for "Miscellaneous expenses, Supreme Court, District of Columbia." for the fiscal year 1912, amounting to \$8,349.95, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had adopted a repli-